

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXII.

BALTIMORE, NOVEMBER, 1907.

No. 7.

ALL OF THE FIVE FICTITIOUS ITALIAN EDITIONS OF WRITINGS OF MACHIAVELLI AND THREE OF THOSE OF PIETRO ARETINO PRINTED BY JOHN WOLFE OF LONDON (1584-1589). III.

One striking point of this list is the absence of licenses for all books, whether Psalms of David or *Ragionamenti* of Pietro Aretino from 1584 up to the *Arte della Guerra*, s. a. and 1587, and then again their regular presence in all cases, whether religious books or Machiavelli and Pietro Aretino, after that time. The explanation for this is found in the Star Chamber Decree of June, 1586, mentioned above. For while the Lambard draft of an Act of Parliament¹ in 1580 did not wish to meddle with unpatented books printed in a foreign language, this decree does not recognize any exception as far as the language is concerned and demands 'that no person—shall ymprint—any booke—Except the same book—hath been heeretofore allowed, or hereafter shall be allowed before the ymprintinge thereof, accordinge to th[e] order appoyned by the Queenes maiesties *Iniunctions*, And been first seen and pervsed by the Archbishop of CANTERBURY and Bishop of LONDON,' reservations being only made for her Majesty's service. The *Arte della Guerra* can only apparently be posterior to this date because there is no reason to assume that an application for a license would have been refused, since even the English translation of it could appear repeatedly and had been dedicated to the Queen in person. Hence its preparation had probably been begun before the issue of that decree and its print may have been completed in 1586 because the title page with 1587 is a substitute for the original one

¹This draft proposed to establish Governors of the English Print, without whose permission no work or writing 'eyther in the Ingleshe tongue only, or in any other language and the Ingleshe tongue iointly' should henceforth be printed. It was designed to check the bad moral effects of the ever increasing print of light literature.

and therefore does not prove that the book itself was printed in that year. The *Historie* which likewise bear the date of 1587 are later than it and presuppose its existence.² The *Pastor Fido*, on the other hand, may have been exempted from the requirement of a license because it was destined for a royal wedding and not printed at Wolfe's but at the editor's expense.

Another striking thing is the absolute indifference towards actual fact in dating not only reprints but also original publications from a foreign place, or even from two different places at the same time, e. g., the *Historie* from Piacenza, the *Descripttione* from Anversa, the *Asino d'Oro* from Roma, the *Columbeis* from Londinum and Lugdunum, the *Arte della Guerra* from Palermo and nowhere. The reason for such a singular proceeding lay in business considerations. As London was located in the 'ultime parti di Europa' and as in particular the printing of Italian books there was still such a new thing, London publishers were afraid that the date of London might put their books at a discount in Italy and other parts of the continent. Testimony to this effect is borne by no lesser man than Giordano Bruno in the interrogatory to which he was subjected by the Holy Inquisition at Venice in 1592.³ *Inter [rogatus]: Se li libri stampati sono in effetto stati stampati nelle città e luochi secondo l'impression loro, o pur altrove. Resp[ondit]: tutti quelli che dicono nella impression loro, che sono stampati in Venetia, sono stampati in Inghilterra, et fu il stampator, che volse metterve che erano stampati in Venetia per*

²The *Arte* is the only volume of the series which appeared without a preface to the Reader and with so many misprints that it does not seem to have enjoyed the same supervision. The Preface to the *Historie* does not include the *Arte* in the enumeration of the writings of Machiavelli which still remain to be published. This proves that it must have been printed before.

³The original documents [perhaps with slight modernizations of spelling?] are published from the Venetian Archives by Domenico Berti in his most interesting work: *Bruno da Nola, Sua Vita e Sua Dottrina, Nuova Edizione*, 1889, p. 399.

renderli più facilmente, et acciò havessero maggior esito, perchè quando s'havesse detto, che fossero stampati in Ingilterra, più difficilmente se haveriano venduti in quelle parti, et quasi tutti li altri ancora sono stampati in Inghilterra, ancor che dicano a Parigi, o altrove.' In fact, type, spacing, initials and other ornaments all tend to show that his *De l'infinito uniuerso et Mondi* and *De la causa, principio, et Vno*, both *Stampati in Venetia*, as well as his *Spaccio de la Bestia Trionfante, Stampato in Parigi, De Gl'Heroici Furori* and *Cabala del Cavallo Pegaseo*, both *Parigi, Appresso Antonio Baio* and *La Cena de le Ceneri*, s. l., are all products of the same London press which, in spite of expert opinion to the contrary quoted in the Quarterly Review, October, 1902, p. 495, I still hold to have been that of Vautrollier rather than that of John Wolfe or somebody else.⁴

If other London printers had no scruples about putting the names of foreign places on their books in order to have a better sale for them, there was no reason why John Wolfe should have had any, and we see how he even carried his shrewdness so far as to issue the same book under two different titles, one for the foreign market and one for home consumption. Not the copy of Stella's *Columbeis* with London on its title, but that with Lyons was sent to the Frankfort fair, just as in the case of the *Arte della Guerra*, not the copies with Palermo, which did not enjoy a special reputation as a place of printing on the continent, but those *sine loco* were sent to Frankfort⁵ and are

⁴A detailed proof is out of question in this article. I, therefore, confine myself to saying that John Wolfe who is the only other London printer who could possibly be considered as the printer of Giordano Bruno, does not seem to me to have printed these volumes. Not only tradition and the fact that he was a Frenchman speak in favor of Vautrollier, but also typographical reasons. Thus the italics and the spacing of the lines in the stanza beginning : 'Mio passar solitario' in the *Epistola Proemiale* of Bruno's *De l'infinito uniuerso et Mondi* are identical with those in *Alexander Dicsonus a lectori S. in Alexandri Dicsoni Arelii de vmbra rationis et iudicij, etc. Londini, Excudebat Thomas Vautrollerius Typographus, 1583.*

⁵*Collectio in unum corpus omnium librorum Hebraeorum, Graecorum, Latinorum neenon Germanice, Italice, Gallicè & Hispanice scriptorum, qui in nundinis Francofurtensibus ab anno 1564 usque ad nundinas Autumnales anni 1592, partim noui, partim noua forma, & diversis in locis editi, venales extiterunt.—in tres Tomos distincta—Francofurti—Officina*

found to this day in most continental libraries.

The licenses in the Stationers' Registers which appear to be either inexact or transferred to others or not used at all are the following :

1. *The historie of China*, both in Italian and English, Sept. 13, 1587.
2. A booke in Italian, Intytuled *Libretto de Abacho*. To be pryned in Italian and Englishe | April 9, 1589.
- 2*. to be printed in Englishe and Italian | *Libretto Di Abacho per far imparare gli fighioli, gli principii Dell' Arithmeticca* | Aug. 27, 1590.
3. *Essame degli Ingegn[os]*, to be printed in Italian and Englishe, Aug. 5, 1590.
4. *a letter sente to Don BERNARDIN DI MENDOZZA, with th[e] adverisementes out of Ireland*, in the Italian tongue, Oct. 23, 1588.
5. *Il decamerone di BOCCACCIO* | in Italian . . . Authorised by Th[e] archbishop of CANTERBURY, Sept. 13, 1587.
6. *Lettere di PIETRO ARETINO* (no language stated). (Oct. 14, 1588.)

In the case of No. 1 Wolfe seems to have presented a Spanish instead of an Italian original, for he printed in the following year for Edward White: *The Historie of the great and mightie kingdome of China, etc., Translated out of Spanish by R. Parke*. As for Nos. 2 and 2*, which are apparently identical, I am inclined to suspect that the book itself was printed in English and that only the title was both in Italian and in English, as in the case of the Italian grammar of Scipio Lentulo, translated by Henry Granthan, reprinted by Vautrollier in 1587.⁶ A copy of Wolfe's *Libretto* does not exist

*Nicolai Bassei M.D.XII. 1, 586 Julii Cesaris Stellæ, Nob. Rom. Columbeidos libri priores duo. Lugd. 1586. A (i. e. autumn fair of 1586) and III, 28 : I sette libri dell'arte della guerra, etc., 1588. V. (i. e. lenten fair of 1588). This collective catalogue, as well as some of the separate fair catalogues, show that Wolfe sent his Latin and Italian books there very diligently. I have only failed to find those of 1584; the *Asino d'Oro*, which is omitted in this Collection, is contained in a catalogue of the lenten fair of 1589.*

⁶*La Grammatica di M. Scipio Lentulo | Napolitano da lui in latina lingua Scritta, | & hora nella Italiana, & Inglese | tradotta da H. G. | An Italian Grammer | written in Latin by Sci- | pio Lentulo a Neapolitane: And tur- | ned into Eng- | lishe by Hen- | ry Granthan. | device | Imprinted at London*

in the British Museum, but, if it corresponded to the *Libretto de Abaco*, printed by Francesco de Tomaso di Salo e compagni, Venetia, s. a., it contained only sixteen octavo pages of multiplication tables and the like which did not call for an edition in two languages. No. 3 was apparently transferred to Adam Islip and printed by him in English for R. Watkins under the title : *Juan de Diós Huarte Navarro, Examen de Ingenios. The Examination of men's wits—Translated out of the Spanish tongue by M. C. Camilli. Englished out of his Italian by R[ichard] C[arew]*, etc. 1594. The time is the same when the other transfers from Wolfe to Islip occurred, which were discussed at some length in note 2. A reprint of the Italian text in England seems to be out of the question, because it would have been impossible to compete with Aldo and other Italian publishers who were printing it at the time.⁷

No. 4 appears to have been ceded to Vautrollier and printed in English only, unless the '*Esempio d'una lettera mandata d'Inghilterra à Don Bernardin di Mendoza*, etc., in 8°, *In Leida*, found in a Frankfort lenten fair catalogue of 1589 should be printed by Wolfe, which, in view of an edition with a similar title given in the British Museum Catalogue with another publisher's name, is not likely. The title of the English edition—there is more than one—printed by Vautrollier for Field, which Mr. Arundell Esdaile of the British Museum has kindly looked up for me, reads : '*The Copie of a Letter sent out of England : to Don Bernardin Mendoza Ambassadour in France for the King of Spaine, Declaring the state of England . . . Whereunto are adioyned certaine late Advertisements [out of Ireland], concerning the losses and distresses happened to the Spanish Nauie*

by Thomas Vautrollier | dwelling in the Blackfriers | 1587. The first edition printed in 1575 has only an English title. Since I have been obliged to cite this grammar, I will add a phonetic item from the first edition, page 17: 'Neither will I omyt hovv farre the pronunciation of vouluelles, is to be obserued : O and E are pronounced somtymes more darkely and somtymes more clearly. And most darkely in these wordes, *Amore*, *Colore*, *Ardore*, and such like. But E is pronounced more clearly in this vvorde *Erba* : and O, in this vvorde *Ottima*. Neuerthelesse the manner of pronouncing cannot be shewved by vwriting : vvhatever it is to be learned of him, that hath th' Italian tonge.'

⁷ Aldo in 1590, others in 1582 and 1586.

[i. e., the famous Armada], etc.' Our theory that Wolfe transferred his licenses in the case of this book and the preceding to Vautrollier and Islip becomes practically a certainty by the fact that no license is recorded for either of the latter. The Beadle of the Company would not have brooked any attempt at an infringement of his rights.

Nos. 5 and 6, finally, have as it seems, neither been printed by Wolfe nor by any other London printer. As for the *Decamerone* a more careful consideration of the financial side of the question may have sufficed to induce Wolfe to abandon the project. For while in the cases of Machiavelli and Pietro Aretino all of whose works had been forbidden by the Roman church there was not only no Italian competition but an Italian demand, here the reverse was the case. New editions of the *Decamerone* were appearing constantly and even if Wolfe's collaborer had succeeded in obtaining a better text than Salviati's,⁸ it is not probable that it could have competed with the Italian texts of the day. It is, therefore, hardly necessary to account for the apparent non-existence of Wolfe's *Decamerone* by the assumption that the Archbishop of Canterbury retracted his consent, as a little over thirty years later a license granted for 'Decameron of Master John Boccace' was 'recalled by my lord of Canterburyes command' March 22, 1620 (III, 667).

In the case of the Letters of Pietro Aretino there was no Italian competition to be feared, yet either a realization of the magnitude of the enterprise which far surpassed any he had undertaken yet, or a disagreement with his collaborer regarding the details of the plan may have caused Wolfe to abandon the matter. For in the Paris edition of

⁸ *Il | Decamerone | di Messer | Giovanni Boccaceci | Cittadin Fiorentino, | Di nuono ristampato, e riscontrato in | Firenze con testi antichi, & alla sua | vera lezione ridotto | dal | Cavalier Lionardo Salviati | etc. Seconda Editione | flower-de-luce in elaborate setting | In Firenze Del mese d' Ottobre. | Nella stamperia d' Giunti, M.D.LXXXII.* It is doubtless to one of Salviati's editions that Barbagrigia (*Ragionamenti*, 1584) refers when he says of his own prospective edition of the centonouelle : '*Le quali anchora vn giorno spero di darui a leggere, cosi compiute, come egli le compose, & non lacerate, come hoggi i vostri Fiorentini ve le danno a leggere, con mille ciancie loro, per farui credere d'hauerle ritornate a la prima lettura.*'

1609⁹ 'the letters fill six octavo volumes and his collaborer's plan to classify the letters according to their contents under the heads of '*Consolanti, Confortanti*,' etc., cannot be called a felicitous one if it was feasible at all. Whatever may have induced Wolfe to give up his project, it cannot be supposed that he really carried it out in view of the fact that the British Museum does not possess a single volume of it and that a Paris bookseller could undertake the sumptuous publication twenty years later.

The Fictions of Barbagrigia and Antoniello degli Antonielli and the Personality of Wolfe's Italian Colaborer.

Barbagrigia is not an invention of John Wolfe's collaborer but of Annibale Caro, the author of the *Commento di Ser Agresto da Ficaruolo sopra la prima ficta del Padre Siceo* and the *Nasea*.¹⁰ Yet while Caro puts his graceful poetic preface in the mouth of this fictitious person in order to forego the necessity of writing two prosy ones, Wolfe and his collaborer use Barbagrigia and his double, Antoniello degli Antonielli, and their Heirs merely in order to conceal their own names. Nor do they take pains to adhere to this fiction very logically, for the Heirs of Antoniello publish the *Discorsi* and the *Prencipe* in 1584 and Antoniello himself the *Arte della Guerra* three years later; Barbagrigia's own preface to the *Ragionamenti I & II* is dated October 21, 1584, that of his Heir to the *Commento di Ser Agresto* January 12 of the same year. Then both Barbagrigia and Antoniello and their Heirs disappear from the scene and other stampatori with and without a name take their places; with Machiavelli first, the Heirs of Gioilito, then a printer without a name, with Pietro Aretino first a nameless man, then Andrea del Melagrano. Even if these changes of printers

⁹ There is only one print of this edition, but there exist two different title-pages of the first and fourth volumes; on one of the latter the year is M.D.C.VIII. instead of M.D.C.IX.

¹⁰ The original edition seems to be the one of 1539, which contains besides the leaf with the title 77 numbered and 20 unnumbered pages. On the last: *Stampata in Balduccio per Barbagrigia da Bengodi: con Gratia, & Priuilegio della bizzarissima Academia de Virtuosi—alla prima acqua d'Agosto, l'Anno. M.D.XXXIX.*

were not accompanied by several changes of type, of which four different kinds are used in our eight editions, it would be clear that it was Wolfe's desire to offer fresh inducements to foreign purchasers and not to advertise himself exactly as the printer of the much decried *Discorsi* and *Prencipe* and such a piece of pornographical literature as the *Ragionamenti I & II*. I say to advertise, because the whole fictions were too transparent not to be known to the initiated in London and, as we have seen above, he did not refrain from using the device of the palm-tree, the guardian of the secret, anew when five and six years later he printed the books of Gabriell and Richard Harvey for which it seemed particularly appropriate.

But who was Wolfe's collaborer? and do Barbagrigia and Antoniello conceal the same person? As to the second question, I think there can be no serious doubt that it is one and the same person, however much the prefaces of the *Ragionamenti I & II* and of the *Commento* may differ in tone in some of their parts from that of the *Discorsi*. Special points in common are, above all, first the desire of publishing as complete a set as possible of their respective authors' works, and then the effort, or at least the pretense at an effort, to obtain as good texts as possible. The printer to the Heirs of Antoniello speaks of having tried to obtain the authors' autograph manuscript of the *Discorsi* and mentions the editions used by him, and Barbagrigia and his successor always lay stress upon their wish to present a text that is exactly as the author has composed it and the latter likewise mentions the texts used by him in case of the *Comedie*. To be sure these would be matters of course to-day, but they are unique in the whole history of the reprints and translations of Machiavelli from 1532 to 1660. If, then, the two stand for one and the same person, who was it? Certainly a native Italian of literary taste. That is evident from the character of the language, from the whole tenor of the prefaces and when he speaks of London as a place (*per altro nobile & illustre*) *nella quale non ci è per l'adietra giamai stampata* (*che io mi sappi*) *cosa alcuna di conto*,¹¹ which a patriotic Englishman would never have said. Among the native Italians with whom Wolfe is

¹¹ Preface of the *Discorsi*.

known to have entertained business relations scarcely more than one man can seriously come into question. Giacopo Castelvetri, the editor of the *Columbeis* and the *Pastor Fido* was too distinguished ; the same would be true of Alberico Gentili¹² and his brother Scipio, who besides writes a very different style. Battista Aurelio, a man of most earnest religious interests, and Francesco Betti, a sufferer for faith' sake who probably never saw English soil, cannot have lent Wolfe a hand at all. This leaves only Manelli, the translator of Tacitus' *Agricola*, of whose circumstances and life in England unfortunately nothing is known to me ; and Petruccio Ubaldino, the author of Wolfe's first Italian book, in whose life, character and style of writing there is nothing that would forbid us to see in him the collaborator for whom we are looking, unless it be that he would not have made the disparaging statement about books printed in London in view of the recent publication of his own *Vita di Carlo Magno*.

Petruccio Ubaldino does not only usher in and herald Wolfe's publication of Italian books, but his transfer of his patronage from Wolfe to Field, whether after a difference of opinion about the Letters of Pietro Aretino, or other matters, or after a peaceable separation, marks also the end of it, for no Italian book has left Wolfe's press after 1591. Under such circumstances it may perhaps be regarded as more than a mere coincidence that the editor of Wolfe's last work of Aretino speaks of presenting it '*in guisa di nouella phenice*' and that a new phenix is the very device which Ubaldino henceforth uses on all his books save his *Rime*.¹³ Furthermore we know that, though he had originally come to England to find employment in military service, he was obliged to make a living with his pen during the years of his business connection with Wolfe and had a hard time doing so. In his *Descrittione del Regno di*

¹² Alberico Gentili was one of the most noted professors of law of his time. Two books of his printed by Wolfe are mentioned by Arber, v, 127 and 147.

¹³ The device of the new phenix is found on the titles of the following five books : *Parte Prima delle brevi dimostrazioni et precetti vitissimi*, etc., 1592 ; *Lo Stato delle tre Corti*, etc., 1594 ; *Scelta di alcune attioni et di varii accidenti*, etc., 1595 ; *Militia del Granduca di Thoseana*, etc., 1597, and *La Vita di Carlo Magno*, etc., 1599. The device of the *Rime*, etc., 1596, is an adder which has struck its teeth in a finger and is held over a fire.

Scotia, dedicated to Sir Christopher Hatton, Count of Leicester and Sir Francis Walsingham, 1588, he speaks of the '*continuata procella*' of his '*nemica fortuna*' and implores them to aid him '*con libera mano*' or '*con chariteuole opera*.' Three years later in his *Vite delle Donne Illustri*, dedicated to Queen Elizabeth, the last book of his printed by Wolfe, he reminds the Queen of his past services to the Crown and describes his recent condition saying : '*sono stato costretto per non passare il tempo in vn'otio biasimeuole; et per nutrir la mia famiglia, lontana affatto da ogni essercitio otioso, ad essercitar la pena*,' an appeal which, by the way, does not seem to have been fruitless because some of his following books are dated '*Della Corte*.' Nevertheless he never became quite happy again, annoyed by the misty air of England which Elizabeth alone can make serene :

*Voi sola in me seren potete, e chiaro
Render l'aer grauato hoggi da nebbia
Noiosa à gli occhi miei, acre, e mordace.¹⁴*

troubled by the gout which makes life a burden to him¹⁵ and not always free from pangs of conscience about his former doings and writings. Nor would it be a surprise if the same man who as Barbarigia contemptuously referred to the '*Masticatori di Pater nostri, et Cuccatori di Auemarie*' and who as his Heir in introducing the *Commento di Ser Agresto* said : *lascia gracchiare i Cornacchioni, che non seruono hoggimai d'altro nel mondo, che di spauentar i bamboli, et le donniciuole, che si crederanno, leggendo sonigliante galanterie, di douer eader tutte fredde ne le bollente caldaie di satanas-* so,' should speak at another time, as Ubaldino does in one of his sonnets to God :¹⁶

*Deh voglia il Ciel, ch'in questi ultimi giorni,
Dopo tanti anni rei passati, e vissi:
Quan'io mal feci, ah! lasso, e quan'io scrissi
Corregga, e fugga di Sathan gli scorni.

Gradisci, ô Padre, ô Dio, ch'io homai ritorni
Sotto'l soave giogo: e i pensier fissi
Da qui innanzi habbia in te sempre, e gli abissi
Apri di tua pietà senza soggiorni.*

¹⁴ *Rime*, First Sonnet.

¹⁵ *Militia del Granduca*, etc. Dedication to Elizabeth.

¹⁶ *Rime*, Carta E, 3 back. The chronology of this sonnet is offering difficulty because, if Ubaldino states his age correctly as $11\frac{1}{2}$ lustri, i. e., about 58 years, it cannot very well have been composed after 1585 when he had only published one out of the nine books of his own.

Finally, there are a number of stylistic peculiarities in which Petruccio Ubaldino and the writer of the prefaces to the editions of Machiavelli and Pietro Aretino resemble each other, such as the frequent use of the parenthesis, the inclination to assume an air of modesty by inserting *s'io non erro* or *s'io non m'inganno*, and a pronounced didactic tendency. Thus Ubaldino says in the *Aggiunta al Lettore* in his *Vite delle Donne III*: 'Et si sono fatte l'annotationi per tutta opera in margine, parte per memoria delle cose auuenute, & parte per precetti, & ammaestramenti necessarij à chi legge historie,' and the writer of the Preface of the *Ragionamenti III*: 'Oltre a ciò saran in margine notate le di lui belle e proprie maniere di scriuere, tutte le comparationi e tutti i proverbi . . . le quali (i. e., maniere di dire) se ne le menti vostre noterete, come vo credere, vi faranno tanto honore, e tanto utile vi recheranno ne lo scriuere, e nel comporre, etc.'

All these things make a pretty strong chain of circumstantial evidence that Petruccio Ubaldino was John Wolfe's collaborer in the eight editions of Machiavelli and Pietro Aretino. A direct admission on his part that he wielded his pen also in that line is lacking.

Editions of Pietro Aretino and Machiavelli published in Italy during the first half of the following century.

Although the works of both Pietro Aretino and Machiavelli were so strictly prohibited in Italy that an open reproduction of them was entirely out of question, there were subterfuges by means of which it was possible to reprint them that were far from being as innocent as the fictions of Barbagrigia and Antoniello degli Antonielli and the names of Italian cities and London title-pages. On the one hand some of the works of Pietro Aretino were issued under different titles as the works of other actual authors, on the other the names of Pietro Aretino and Nicolo Machiavelli were transformed into Partenio Etiro and Amadio Niecollucci, and then a number of their works with their original or more or less altered titles published under the names of those fictitious authors. In addition to this the texts were more or less tampered with and, while Wolfe's collaborer had at least aimed at obtaining the very best texts and refrained from making any changes which he

did not deem corrections, now sometimes in a downright insipid way not only everything that actually touched the representatives of the church and religion was removed, but also innocent references to Popes and other church dignitaries were changed or omitted.

Thus Pietro Aretino's *Marescaleo* and *Hipocrito* are issued as the *Cavallarizzo* and *Finto* of Luigi Tansillo, Vicenza, 1601 and 1610, and the *Cortigiana* as the *Sciocco* of Cesare Caporali '[n]ouamente data in luce da Francesco Buonafede (!!),' Venetia, 1604. A *Vita di Maria Vergine* by Partenio Etiro appears in Venetia, 1628; *Le Carte Parlanti: Dialogo nel quale si tratta del Giuoco con moralità piaceuole* by Partenio Etiro, Venetia, 1650; and besides several more works of Partenio Etiro *De' Discorsi Politici, e Militari Libri Tre, scelti fra grauissimi Scrittori da Amadio Niecollucci Toscano*, Venetia, 1630, and again 1648. While *Le Carte Parlanti* and the *Cavallarizzo*, apart from one apparently involuntary long omission, show comparatively few alterations, the *Cortigiana* and, as may be imagined, more still the *Hipocrito*,¹⁷ the *Tartuffe* of the Italian Renaissance, have suffered considerably and, not to speak of minor omissions and transpositions, some whole chapters have been omitted from Machiavelli's *Discorsi*. The absence of other works of Machiavelli is probably due both to their being fewer in number and less adapted to disguise and to the appearance of the Testina which tried the trick of a false date. In *Mod. Lang. Notes*, vol. xxi (1906), p. 197, I have shown its terminus post quem was 1588 (1581 was of course a misprint), now I can say that its second print is posterior to 1609, but that it certainly existed in 1637 when it is found in the catalogue of a private library in Lyons.

A. GERBER.

Göttingen, Germany.

¹⁷ In the *Hipocrito*, e. g., the *Hipocrito* is a man 'che pende tra il prete, e tra il frate,' 'che affige il viso in terra, e col breuial sotto al braccio.' He is staying 'o per le chiese o per le librerie,' and when addressed, interrupted in his 'diuotioni.' In the *Finto* the *Finto* is a person 'che pende tra il grauissimo, & il leggerissimo,' 'che affige il viso in terra,' the 'breuial' being omitted. He is found 'o per librerie, o su cantoni' and is merely interrupted in his 'quiete.' All the pointedness of Pietro Aretino's characterization has disappeared.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

CHAUCER, *Knight's Tale* 810-811.

This couplet runs (cf. 1668-9):

Yet somtyme it shal fallen on a day
 That falleth not eft withinne a thousand yere.

On this Skeat's note is : 'From the *Teseide*, v. 77. Compare the medieval proverb :—“Hoc facit una dies quod totus denegat annus.” Quoted in Die älteste deutsche Litteratur ; by Paul Piper (1884); p. 283.'

The lines in the *Teseide* are :

Ma come noi veggiam venire in ora
 Cosa che in mill'anni non avviene.

Froissart puts a similar expression into the mouth of John of Gaunt (A. D. 1386). It forms the conclusion of a little story (*Oeuvres*, ed. Ker-vyn de Lettenhove, 11. 344): ““Messire Thomas,” dist le duc, “soiés une autre fois plus avisé, car ce advient en une heure ou en ung jour, qui point n’advient en cent.””

That the expression was proverbial, at least in the Elizabethan period, is indicated by its occurrence, in a somewhat modified form, in Henry Porter's *Two Angry Women of Abington* (1599), where it is put into the mouth of Nicholas, the serving-man, otherwise known as ‘Proverbs,’ because, as another of the characters says, he is a ‘proverb-book bound up in folio.’ Here it runs (4. 3)¹: ‘Well, that happens in an hour that happens not in seven years.’

‘Leafen.’

In Herman Melville's *Typee* (pp. 170, 271 of John Lane's edition), the word *leafen* occurs in a sense not recognized by *NED.*, namely, ‘made of leaves.’ The passages are : ‘Others were plying their fingers rapidly in weaving *leafen* baskets in which to carry the fruit.’ ‘Fruits of various kinds were likewise suspended in *leafen* baskets.’

¹ I owe this reference to Miss Elizabeth W. Manwaring, graduate student in English at Yale University.

Dream of the Rood 54.

On *forðēode* I say in my edition : ‘Kemble and Grein treat this as a transitive verb of which *sciman* is the object. Kemble translates “invaded”; Grein renders in the *Sprachschatz* by “opprimere, subigere,” adding OHG. *fardūhan*, and in the *Dichtungen* by “unterdrückt” (“es hatte der Schatten unterdrückt den Schein der Sonne”). Dietrich renders by “supprimere,” and Stephens by “fell heavy.”’

It seems to me now that *forðēode*, which has caused scholars so much difficulty, may be a scribe's blunder for *sweðrode* (-*ede*, *swiðrode*, -*eden*, -*odon*). Cf. the following :

Gen. 133-4 :

Geseah deore seado
 sweat swiðrian.

Exod. 113 :

scinon scyldhrēoðan, seado swiðredon.

Gu. 1262 :

scān scīrwered ; scadu sweþredon.

But especially An. 836-7^a :

scīre scīnan. Sceadu sweðerodon
 wonn under wolnum.

It will be seen that the association of *seeadu* and *sweðrian*, *scīr* and *sweþrian*, and even *scīnan*, *seeadu*, and *sweðrian*, is not unexampled in Old English. The nearest parallel to our passage is that from *Andreas*. If with this we compare

scīrne scīman ; seeadu sweðrode
 wann under wolnum,

(*sweðrode* instead of *forðēode*), we shall see how natural the substitution appears. If now we consider the individual letters, we discover that of the eight involved, five—*r*, *ð*, and *-ode*—are common, and that the manuscript forms of *s* and *f* are almost identical (cf. ms. *cræstga* for *cræfsta*, *Chr.* 12). We might picture the evolution somewhat as follows : *sweðrode* > **swærðode* > **fwerðode* > **swrðode* > *forðēode*. This does not, of course, imply that each of these blunders was actually made. If the original form were *sweoð(e)rode* (cf. *An.* 465), the *eo* of the second syllable might be still more easily accounted for.

SPENSER, F. Q. 1. 1. 1. 6.

In the line,

His angry steede did chide his foming bitt,
none of the senses of *chide* in *NED.* is satisfactory. Chiding implies noise, and what noise would a horse employ to signify dissatisfaction with his bit?¹ If Spenser had employed 'champs,' instead of 'chide,' it would have seemed more appropriate. He evidently is imitating Virgil, *AEn.* 4. 135²:

Stat sonipes, ac frena ferox spumantia mandit,
though no one appears to have noticed the fact. This is translated by Phaer (1558), 'on the fomy bit of gold with teeth he champes.' Barnaby Googe (1577) has (*Husb.* 3. 115):

There stamping standes the steed, and foamy bridell fierce
he champes.

Stanyhurst (1583) renders, 'on byt gingled he chaumpeth.' Another imitation seems to be in Quarles (1621), *Hadassa*, Int. 222 (*Works*, ed. Grosart, 2. 45):

There stands a Steede, and champes his frothy steele.

Sylvester, Du Bartas's *Fourth Part of the First Day of the Second Week* (*Works*, ed. Grosart, 1. 126), has:

But th' angry Steed, rising and reining proudly,
Striking the stones, stamping and neighing loudly,
Cals for the Combat; plunges, leaps and prances,
Befoams the path, with sparkling eyes he glaunces;
Champs on his burnish bit. . . .

Where Ariosto, *Orl. Fur.* 27. 70, has

Et eran poi venuti ove il destriero
Facea, mordendo, il ricco fren spumoso,

Harington's rendering (1591) is (27. 56):

While he, that stately steed *Frontino* vew'd,
That proudly champing stood upon his bit,
And all his raines with snowlike fome bedew'd.

¹ Dryden (*Pal. and Arc.* 3. 457) has:

The courser pawed the ground with restless feet,
And snorting foamed, and champed the golden bit.

Would this, perhaps, warrant us in assuming that Spenser's *chide* means 'snort'?

² Other lines which might be compared (besides *AEn.* 7. 279) are: *Æschylus, Prom. Bound* 1009; *Apollonius Rhodius, Arg.* 4. 1604-6; *Tibullus* 1. 3. 42; *Ovid, Art.* 1. 20; *Am.* 1. 2. 15; 2. 9. 29, 30; *Statius, Theb.* 3. 268.

Milton's (*P. L.* 4. 858-9)

But, like a proud steed reined, went haughty on,
Champing his iron curb,

may be from *Æschylus, Prom.* 1009-10:

δάκνων δὲ στόμαον ὡς νεοζυγῆς
πῶλος βιάζει, καὶ πρὸς ήρλας μάχει.

Dryden (1697) has:

—Paws the ground,
And champs the golden bit, and spreads the foam around,
and for a similar line (*AEn.* 7. 279):

With golden trappings, glorious to behold,
And champ betwixt their teeth the foaming gold,

where the original is:

Tecti auro, fulvum mandunt sub dentibus aurum.

On the other hand, Caxton has the verb *gnaw* (*Eneydos* (1490), E. E. T. S. Extra Series, No. 57): ' . . . gnawynge his bytte garnysshed wyth botones³ of golde, all charged wyth the seume of the horse.' Chaucer's (*L. G. W.* 1208)

The fomy bridel with the bit of gold,
does not help us as respects the verb, but his (*K. T.* 1648-9)

The fomy stedes on the golden brydel
Gnawinge

shows what verb he prefers. The latter, though it translates Boccaccio, *Tes.* 7. 97,

Quivi destrier grandissimi vediensi
Con selle ricche di argento e di oro,
E gli spumanti lor freni rodiensi,

may be ultimately referred to Virgil.

As Caxton and Chaucer have *gnaw*, Gawin Douglas has *gnyp*, as a variant of *rung* (cf. Fr. *ronger*). Thus, for *AEn.* 4. 135, Ruddiman (1710) gives us, from the Ruthven MS.:

Gnyppand the fomy goldin bit gingling,
where Small reads (Elphynstoun MS.):

Rungeand the fomy goldin bitt jingling,
and the edition (from the Trinity MS.) of the Bannatyne Club (1. 196. 11):

Rungeand the fomy goldyn byt gynglyng.
For *AEn.* 7. 279 Small's edition has:

Thai runge the goldin mollettis burneist brycht,

³ Douglas' *mollettis*, below.

the variants being : Ruddiman, *rang* ; Ruddiman, *burnist* ; Bannatyne, *burnyst bright*.

Gower, though he knows the verbs *r(o)unge* and *gnaw*, as shown by *Conf. Am.* 2. 520 :

For evere on hem I rounge and gnawe,

prefers *chew* with reference to the bit (which he calls bridle). Thus, *Conf. Am.* 3. 1629 :

Betre is upon the bridel chiewe ;
and 6. 929-30 :

—upon the bridel
I chiewe.

Fairfax prefers the verb *eat*. Where Tasso writes (*Ger. Lib.* 10. 15),

Fumar li vedi ed anelar nel corso,
E tutto biancheggiar di spuma il morso,

Fairfax translates :

The coursers pant and smoke with lukewarm sweat,
And foaming cream, their iron mouthfuls eat.

Shakespeare, too, goes his own way (*Ven. and Adon.* 269) :

The iron bit he crusheth 'tween his teeth.

In none of these, save possibly in Dryden, as quoted in the first foot-note, do we find any warrant for Spenser's *chide*.

Did the bit jingle, as well as the bridle? It would seem so, from Douglas' and Stanyhurst's translations. Skeat (on *Cant. Tales A* 170) explains

And, whan he rood, men mighte his brydel here
Ginglen in a whistling wind—

as due to 'the habit of hanging small bells on the bridles and harness,' and this seems borne out by B 3984 and the other passages he quotes. Instances, indeed, occur as early as Greek times (Aristophanes, *Frogs* 963 (the amusing compound, *κωδωνοφαλαροπάλους*) ; Euripides, *Rhes.* 307. On the other hand, Gasecoigne (1576) has rings in mind (*Complaint of Philomene: Steele Glas*, ed. Arber, p. 90; *Works*, ed. Hazlitt, 2. 223)):

And in hir left a snaffle Bit or brake,
Bebost with gold, and many a gingling ring.

The *ψάλιον*, sometimes translated 'bit,' and by some considered to be a curb-chain, is interpreted by Daremberg and Saglio's *Dict. des Antiqu.*, as

a cassisson. In any case, it produced a sound when the horse was in motion (Aristophanes, *Peace* 155 : *χρυσοχαλίνων πάταγον ψαλίων*; Äelian, *Hist. Anim.* 6. 10: *ψαλίων κρότον καὶ χαλινῶν κτύπον*). The *Dict. des Antiqu.* says (p. 1336): 'Il est facile, en effet, de comprendre qu'il devait retenir en heurtant les anneaux de la longe et les divers accessoires suspendus autour de la tête.'

SPENSER, F. Q. 1. Int. 3. 5.

Did Jonson, when writing (in 'Queen and huntress, chaste and fair')

Lay thy bow of pearl apart,

have in mind Spenser's

Lay now thy deadly Heben bowe apart ?

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

THE PLAYS OF PAUL HERVIEU.

M. Hervieu is the author of nine plays, which bear the following titles and dates of production :

Les Paroles restent, 1892.

Les Tenailles, 1895.

La Loi de l'homme, 1897.

La Course du flambeau, 1901.

L'Énigme, 1901.

Point de Lendemain, 1901.

Théroigne de Méricourt, 1902.

Le Dédale, 1903.

Le Réveil, 1905.

Point de Lendemain, though first produced before the *Cercle de l'union artistique* in 1890, was not given real publicity till 1901, when it was presented at the Odéon.

If we had only the first of these plays before us we might ascribe to the author an originality all his own, independent of any source, and indebted to his time only for the setting and subject of his drama. At the outset of his dramatic career the critics were unanimous in characterizing his talent as original and even singular, not to say unique. His success was heightened by the novelty of his subject. In *Les Paroles restent* he has made a

tragedy of which gossip is the mainspring and the hero. I know of no other play based so entirely on this motif, and I know of no author, in novel or in drama, who has been so successful in subordinating the element of love, which nearly all literature in these two genres teaches us to regard as the paramount human interest. Nay, I should except one surpassing genius, Balzac, who had the profaning power to substitute the god of money in the shrine of love. And let me assert here, though I find my opinion corroborated by no critic—indeed, French critics do not always trouble themselves about sources—that Balzac is beyond doubt one of the literary ancestors of Hervieu, in his realism of objective observation, no less than in his inability at times to suppress his own ego, in his characters moved each by some single dominant passion, even in his style, *qui choquait les habitudes prises*, and the merits of which were contested till the critics understood that a new message needed a new language, and recognition, at first withheld, was forced. Let me quote from the classic and reactionary Brunetière in his review of *Les Tenailles*¹: “Il y a des défauts qui n'en sont plus dès qu'ils sont, je ne dis pas la rançon ou l'envers mais la condition de certaines qualités —et tel est bien le cas de ceux que l'on reprenait chez M. Paul Hervieu. Si l'on a pu s'y tromper jadis, nous ne craignons plus que l'on s'y méprenne après le succès des Tenailles, et nous nous en réjouissons pour l'auteur, mais encore plus pour nous, et pour l'art.”

We need not be surprised to learn that charitable friends attempted to deter Hervieu from the dramatic career. They told him that his play, plunging as it does, *in medias res*, neglected the rule that *le théâtre est l'art des préparations*. They complained of his rudeness of attack and his too vigorous touch. “Ce style solide et contourné,” says Larroumet,² “d'un relief métallique et coupant, paraissait à beaucoup le contraire d'un style de théâtre.” We may rejoice to know that the author did not sacrifice his originality upon the altar of this well meaning but stupid friendship.

Les Paroles restent shows us a society of idlers,

blasés, ennuyés, finding their chief interest in the *flirts* of the members of their set and in destroying if possible the reputation of the women concerned. One woman, Régine de Vesles, is *dépaysée* in this atmosphere of virulent gossip, but is unable to escape its poison. She moves along, unwitting, with her reputation in ruins about her. Nohan, indiscreet author of the scandal, atones by his remorse and love, and their passion, elevated by her nobleness and purified by suffering, is about to attain consummation when malicious gossip, envious of so chaste a union, destroys the lover's life. “Les paroles restent—et elles tuent” is the climax of the play.

I repeat, the play is original, it is even disturbing in its originality. We may imagine resemblances to other authors; thus Régine recalls Renée de Mauperin, the Comte de Ligueil might be a Don Ruy Gomez togged out in modern clothes; Lady Bristol is the typical English silhouette of French literature. But amid doubts certain features stand out clearly. The play is logical, it is lacking in *hors d'œuvre*, it is a play with a purpose, that purpose is a moral one, and in spite of the oddity of the subject that purpose is clear: it is a defense of marriage, or rather an attack upon conditions that mar the married state. We need not seek further for the immediate ancestry of Hervieu. Dumas *filis* is his parent, perhaps with a collateral descent from Augier, but Dumas *filis*, the initiator of the modern play, with its direct observation of life, its rapidity of dialogue, its logic and simplicity of means, lives again in Hervieu, and with a more complete reincarnation in that Hervieu adopts also the morality of purpose which Dumas had transmitted to no previous heir.

If any doubt remains it is dispelled by *Les Tenailles*. Never did Dumas advance a problem with more boldness or in clearer terms. With *Les Tenailles*, too, the manner of Hervieu, a little uncertain yet in *Les Paroles restent*, is fixed. In the latter play there are some accessory rôles, there is, as in Dumas, an effort to please. But in *Les Tenailles* we have the acme of restraint, of sobriety. There are only the actors indispensable to the plot. Five characters suffice for the discussion of a moral and social problem, for the tragic exposition of a duel between two wills.

¹ *Revue des deux mondes*, 1895, page 953.

² *Revue de Paris*, 1897, page 139.

This struggle between two wills, hedged in by the law, which is a fortress for one, a prison for the other, and exasperated on the one hand by selfishness, on the other by suffering, such is the theme of *Les Tenailles*, a theme which is to be repeated with variations, in *La Loi de l'homme* and *l'Énigme*. We face the problem in the opening speeches of the two women in the play.

Pauline. Enfin, qu'est-ce que tu reproches à ton mari?

Irène, avec force. Je lui en veux de ne pas l'aimer.

It is a thunderbolt hurled at the legal violation of marriage, à la *Dumas fils*; but the subtler nature of the problem bears witness to the passage of Bourget and the feminism of modern France, while the realism of the chief characters, dramatically foreshortened each to a single dominant passion, is stamped with the influence of Balzac and his successors. Fergan, with his passion for mastery and being always in the right, and Irène, with her enthusiasm for the ideal, represent the opposing poles of an irremediable incompatibility. It is but natural that she should find in another that happiness hitherto denied her, natural, too, that the consequences of this fatal union should wreck the lives of both in inevitable tragedy. I know of no more tragic climax than the end of *Les Tenailles*. Irène, to keep her son with her, confesses to Fergan that he is not the father of her child. The husband's pride is broken, he demands the divorce which he formerly refused to grant. But Irène in her turn refuses. "Je ne l'accepte plus. Ma jeunesse est passée, mes espérances sont abolies, mon avenir de femme est mort." "Alors, qu'est ce que vous voulez que je devienne, ainsi, face à face avec vous, toujours, toujours? Quelle existence voulez-vous que je mène?" "Nous sommes rivés au même boulet. Mettez-vous enfin à en sentir le poids et à le tirer aussi. Il y a assez longtemps que je le traîne toute seule."

I have said that the subject of *Les Tenailles* is also that of *La Loi de l'homme*. But it is here still more tragic and more painful. A woman, deceived by her husband, is unable to find in the law the means whereby to prove her grievance, though in a like case of fault on the

part of the wife the husband would be amply protected. She must content herself with a separation à l'amiable, which leaves her her daughter but takes her fortune. The purpose of the play is to show the iniquity of the law, and it is well shown. The logic of the situation leads to an inevitable dénouement and an equally inevitable *quod erat demonstrandum*. The faithless husband keeps his mistress; the abandoned wife brings up her daughter. But the mistress has a son born in honourable wedlock, and during a visit of Isabelle to her father the two young people meet and love. To prevent this marriage, which appears to her in the light of an unnatural union and one which delivers her daughter into the hands of her enemies, Mme de Raguais reveals the infidelity of her spouse. D'Orcieu, the husband of the latter's mistress, after the first spasm of rage and despair, insists on saving appearances from the wreck of honour, and decrees that Mme de Raguais shall return to her consort, as he himself will continue to live with his faithless wife. Thus is the heroine doubly a victim, and must take up her heavy burden and bear it in agony and without resignation to the end. The triumph of the young lovers, rising flower-like from this morass of immorality, only serves by contrast to emphasize the ruin of their parents' happiness.

But so truly are we the children of our works, in literature as well as in character, that the episode which ends so dramatically *La Loi de l'homme* becomes the germ of the next play, to my mind the greatest the author has yet produced. The sacrifice of parents to children is the subject of *La Course du flambeau*. Here again Hervieu has distinguished himself, as in *Les Paroles restent*, by the originality of his theme, and by the power to maintain its interest at the expense of the ever-recurring topic of love. The reference of the title is to the *λαμπαδηφορία* of the Greeks, in which citizens in relays ran and transmitted one to the other a torch kindled at the altar of the divinity whose feast they celebrated. "Chaque concurrent courait, sans un regard en arrière, n'ayant pour but que de préserver la flamme qu'il allait pourtant remettre aussitôt à un autre. Et alors désasisi, arrêté, ne voyant plus qu'au loin la fuite de l'étoilement sacré il l'escortait, du moins, par les yeux, de toute son anxiété impuissante, de

tous ses vœux superflus. On a reconnu dans cette Course du flambeau l'image même des générations de la vie." But Hervieu is impartial. This is evidently his own view, but he shows us the reverse of the medal in the reply of Sabine to the speech just quoted : "Je ne conçois pas ainsi les relations de famille. À mon point de vue recevoir la vie engage autant que la donner . . . Puisque la nature n'a pas permis aux enfants de se fabriquer tout seuls, je dis, moi, qu'elle a donc eu l'intention de leur imposer une dette envers ceux qui les mettent au monde." These views form the motives for action of the principal characters of the play, who are more numerous than usual with Hervieu. Mme Fontenais's thought is all for Sabine, Sabine's for Marie-Jeanne, Marie-Jeanne's for her husband ; childless as she is, he is to her *et mari et enfant*. At the supreme moment of choice Sabine kills her mother for her child, who in turn abandons her without hesitation. There is something of the fatalism of the old Greek play about this piece, yet not the fate predestined by the gods, external and superior to humanity, but a fate inherent in human nature, and all the more terrible in that it does not relieve its victims of responsibility. The subject is simply treated, logically developed toward the final catastrophe ; nothing is superfluous, though the number of interests involved has led to greater length than usual. There is in this play *un grand souffle de tragédie* which sweeps everything before it, even our preconceived notions of the duties of parents and children, and leaves us convinced, for the moment at least, of the truth of the author's thesis.

While *La Course du flambeau* is long and somewhat difficult of analysis, *L'Énigme* is the very essence of brevity and conciseness. There are but two acts, the plot is extremely simple, the style clear-cut and devoid of ornament. The play opens in the hunting-lodge of the two brothers Raymond and Gérard de Gourgiran, where they are sojourning with their wives, Giselle and Léonore, the Marquis de Neste, their cousin, and Vivarce, a friend. Neste, left alone with Vivarce, shows him that he is aware of the latter's intrigue with one of the wives, which one, he does not know. They are alike in manner, calm and undisturbed. Their husbands are equally serene in their conjugal bliss, in which, however, there is

little of the ideal, their natures being rather coarse than subtle, characterized by a devotion to sport and to the careless, frivolous life which their social position makes possible. Vivarce denies at first, but to no purpose. Neste seeks to dissuade him from continuing the intrigue. But it is not a commonplace *liaison* ; it is a *grande passion*.

A general conversation later in the evening, à propos of a *fait divers* in the newspaper, reveals to us the views on the violation of marriage of the different actors in this drama. Raymond thinks that deception deserves death ; his sense of property seems the dominant trait in his character, and he would slay the thief of his wife's affection as he would the poacher trespassing on his preserves. Giselle and Léonore think the punishment too severe. Gérard would spare the erring wife but slay the traitor. Vivarce agrees with him. Neste preaches forgiveness of human frailty.

Subsequently, Vivarce is discovered and suicides. Léonore, whose lover he was, betrays herself by her emotion. Gérard is true to his theory. "Je ne te tuerai pas ! . . . Je ne te chasse pas non plus. Je te garde pour te forcer à vivre !" Can we say that the deeper enigma is solved when Gérard declares that "Ce sont les hommes de notre espèce qui, à travers les temps, assurent le règne du mariage, en veillant sur lui, les armes à la main, comme sur une majesté," and when Neste in the closing words of the play retorts : "C'est par nous autres, amis fervents et respectueux de la vie, c'est par nous, pécheurs, qui, dans la créature, soutenons notre sœur de faiblesse, c'est par nous que finira pourtant le règne de Caïn" ?

Point de Lendemain, really his first play, though little known until its production at the Odéon in 1901, is a dainty episode of gallantry. Though scarcely more than a literary trifle it is interesting and important as showing very clearly the influence of Bourget.

Théroigne de Méricourt is difficult of analysis, with its complex historical tableaux of the Revolution. It shows the misinterpretation by the mob of the lofty ideals of reform. I am not so sure of the classification of this drama. Hervieu has been eclectic ; one is reminded in turn of Hugo's *Cromwell*, of *L'Aiglon*, of *le Théâtre libre*, and it may be that in the crucible of his magic talent

these and other dramatic elements have been fused into a new variety. The technic of the stage is so important in this play that one would need to see it acted in order to form an intelligent criticism. It is a work à part.

No such doubt arises in considering his 1903 production, *Le Dédale*. He returns again to Dumas fils and his dramatic evolution is accentuated anew. The title is well chosen. The Cretan labyrinth wrought by Daedalus, the cunning artificer, was not more difficult to trace than the psychic mazes whose involutions we here thread under the artist's guidance, nor did the youths and maidens, Attica's tribute, look with greater horror on the bull-headed monster to whom they were sacrificed than do these victims of their self-wrought fate upon the dread phantoms their frenzied consciences conjure up. Her vieu's "Labyrinth" is a puzzle made of the delicate interrelations of men and women in the world to-day, and his Minotaur is Divorce.

The elements of the problem are simple : their arrangement is the *impasse*. Max de Pogis and his wife, Marianne, are divorced because of an infidelity of the former, committed in a moment of caprice through no weakening of love for his wife. The latter, though her happiness lies in ruins about her, lives on for the sake of her child, sustained by pride and by the friendship of Guillaume Le Breuil, a man who comes to love her truly, purely, to give her his whole life, and eventually to win her hand through friendship, pity, and also because she must save her reputation in the eyes of the world, which has begun to couple her name with his. The pain of her first love is deadened ; in respect for her new husband and love for her boy she finds a semblance of peace, which, however, is rudely disturbed by the reappearance on the scene of Max de Pogis, who sets up a claim to a share in the education and guardianship of their son. The woman for whom he had deserted his wife is dead, and the child is now to him, as to her, the only real interest. Meeting at the bedside of the little Pierre during a dangerous illness, the old love blossoms anew. Marianne discovers that Max has always loved her and he wins her back to his arms. She cannot now go back to her loyal second husband ; that would be a double degra-

dation. She cannot divorce him and re-marry her first husband—that is contrary to the law of France. Guillaume learns the situation, and, though heart-broken, consents to renounce Marianne if Max will do likewise, but the latter refuses, knowing that she loves him. Marianne determines to reject both and to live on for her child, but De Pogis comes to persuade her to leave France with him. He meets Le Breuil ; a quarrel and struggle ensue, at the end of which the second husband drags the first over a precipice into a whirlpool beneath in which both meet their death.

The climax has been criticised as melodramatic, but it evolves naturally from the intense jealousy of the two lovers and from the determination of the first husband not to give up his wife, knowing that he is loved by her. It is a fitting end to the play, but not by any means a solution of its problems. For these indeed we feel that there can be none.

There is a sub-plot and counterpart to the story of Max and Marianne in the domestic affairs of the Saint-Érics, whose course touches the main plot sufficiently to be not merely episodic, but an integral part thereof. Here it is the wife who is fickle. She is brought to her senses by the death of her child, a victim of the same epidemic of diphtheria which so nearly carries off the little Pierre de Pogis. She is utterly broken, but the great heart of Marianne, though bearing bitter burdens, has yet room for comfort and sympathy for her friend. The frail, frivolous black figure in the arms of Marianne is shaken by a great gust of tragedy.

In point of art, the stark simplicity and grandeur of Æschylus or Sophocles are equalled here. In point of human interest, Greek tragedy with its externally intervening fate, blind, undeserved, seems pale and trivial beside this tragedy from within, this drama of responsibility more dread than an *Erinnys*, resulting in a hell on earth compared to which the fields of Asphodel were paradise.

Have we not here, too, one of the essential differences between antiquity and the Christian era ? The gay and sensuous life of Greece and Rome may not now be lived with impunity, because we feel that the joys and sorrows of this life are not

caprices of the gods, the one great gift of Deity being the choice and the opportunity to make or mar our fates.

Though in this play we tread with Hervieu upon pestilential ground there rises lily-like from its bosom the flower of the sanctity of marriage. This is the lesson he inculcates, though to do so, instead of holding up a good example, he seeks to deter us by showing us an evil one. In spite of an almost perfect art Hervieu is no apostle of art for art's sake ; he instructs as well as pleases ; a moralist, continuing the tradition of his literary ancestor, Dumas *filis*, he makes of the stage a pulpit whence he addresses the congregation of the world.

Le Réveil is, as its title indicates, an awakening, the awakening to duty—or shall we say to necessity?—of a pair who for a moment believed they might forget the world and break loose from all the complex bonds fettering them to their respective spheres and enjoy the fruition of an ideal love at the expense of a family and, on his side, of a nation. Thérèse de Mégée, though married and herself the mother of a marriageable daughter, has never known love. It comes to her in the guise of a young prince of a Balkan state, whose family has been banished as the result of a revolution. The father of Prince Jean hopes to restore not himself but his son to the throne, and has made all arrangements for the necessary political upheaval, in which Jean is to lead. He refuses, preferring Thérèse. Touched by the sacrifice, and her resistance beaten down by his pleadings, she is ready to give herself to him. A clandestine meeting is arranged. But the old Prince Grégoire discovers the lovers, separates them by violence, and allowing Thérèse to believe that Jean is dead, he sends her home to her family. The suffering of this followed by the comforting care of her husband reawakens her to a sense of duty. She realizes as if for the first time the devotion of her husband and the disgrace she was about to bring upon him and their child. It becomes necessary in the interests of the latter to attend that very evening a dinner at the house of her prospective parents-in-law. Thérèse, after a struggle, rises to the occasion, and as she appears in her drawing-room in evening attire, Jean who has finally escaped from the custody of his father,

enters. “ Vous m'avez cru mort, et vous vous faisiez belle ! ” he cries. “ Vous n'avez pas assisté à mon calvaire,” she replies. Both realize that a happy consummation of their love is impossible and both yield to the fate of circumstances.

In this most recent play Hervieu attained a new triumph, both in the applause of the public and in that of the critics, though a few of the latter (M. Emmanuel Arène, in the *Figaro*, M. François de Nion in the *Écho de Paris*, M. Émile Faguet in the *Débats*), from a truly French point of view, regret the subordination of psychology to action.

I have already indicated some of the sources from which I consider Hervieu to derive. But his talent is too complex thus summarily to be dismissed. Throughout his works, novels as well as dramas, we see the evidences of an erudition which modesty only partially conceals. One is sure that he has carefully studied not only the great masters of seventeenth century France, but also that antiquity from which they drew their early inspiration. His dramatic style may truly be called classic, in its purity and simplicity as well as in its geometric logic of construction. In his novels, such as *Flirt*, *L'Exorcisée*, *L'Armature*, his solidity is disguised by a mystic subtlety of analysis which belongs at once to the psychologist and to the symbolist, recalls Bourget and Maeterlineck. But the drama, compelling brevity and clearness, has caused the author to abandon all oddity of phrase. By his irony and the tenderness we feel beneath it, by his voluntary logic and his mastery of the stage he places himself in the direct line of descent from the elder Corneille, with whose situations, indeed, his own are sometimes strikingly parallel. His plays do not present merely individual adventures, but such as have far-reaching social significance.

We may, I think, divide his dramas roughly into two groups : the first, in direct continuation of Dumas *filis*, consisting of *Les Tenailles*, *La Loi de l'homme*, *L'Énigme*, and *Le Dédale*, whose manifest purpose is a general defence of the rights of woman ; and the second, more original in subject, but perhaps less so in style, whose motif is the fatality which disengages itself from environment, comprising *Les Paroles restent* and *La Course du flambeau*. Atypical forms, representing at-

tempts along lines later abandoned, are *Point de Lendemain* and *Théroigne de Méricourt*, while *Le Réveil* seems a vigorous fusion of his two main dramatic doctrines, the sanctity of marriage and the fate which is circumstance.

M. Hervieu is still in the forties and he has attained already, in novel and in drama, a sure and honorable position in the history of French literature. Though it is too soon to risk a final judgment, we feel that his plays will live, because they represent, above and beyond their local and temporal atmosphere, general characters and universal problems whose importance is as lasting as the human race itself.

F. J. A. DAVIDSON.

University of Toronto.

NOTES ON THE SPANISH DRAMA.

THE CASE OF CALDERON'S *La Vida es Sueño*. THE CLOAK EPISODE IN LOPE'S *El Honrado Hermano*. WAS TIRSO ONE OF THE AU- THORS OF *El Caballero de Olmedo*?

Life is a dream was first published by the author's brother, Joseph, in the *Primera parte de comedias de don Pedro Calderon de la Barca . . .* 1636; the approbation was signed November 6, 1635. The editor says in the dedicatory preface that he published the collection, not so much because of the "gusto de verlas impressas, como el pesar de aver visto impressas algunas dellas antes de aora por hallarlas todas erradas, mal corregidas, y muchas que no son suyas en su nombre, y otras que lo son en el ageno . . ." There is no record of any edition whatsoever of *La vida es sueño* prior to 1636.

Hartzenbusch saw in Lope de Vega's *El Castigo sin Venganza*, licensed 1634, a reference to Calderon's play; the passage is as follows,—quoted from the manuscript noted below:

"Bien dicen que *nuestra vida*
Es sueño, y que toda es sueño,
Pues que no solo dormidos,
Pero aun estando despiertos,
Cosas imagina un hombre . . ."

But it may be observed: firstly, the autograph copy of *El Castigo sin Venganza* in the Ticknor

Library is dated August 1, 1631; secondly, the expression, *dicen que nuestra vida es sueño*, is much too vague to be a specific reference to a contemporary play which must have been recognized at once as a masterpiece. Had Lope intended an allusion to his rival's *comedia*, he would have accompanied his remarks with words of ironical congratulation or of blunt reproach. He would not have said "dicen," nor enlarged upon the philosophical content of the thought that life is such stuff as dreams are made of, if that thought had just been illustrated so tangibly by Calderon. The concept was, in sooth, a commonplace long before *La vida es sueño* was written. Two centuries earlier the translator of the so-called *Libro de los Gatos* had said: "Mas si los hombres pensasen en este mundo que cosa es, e commo non es otra cosa sinon sueño."¹ The same thought may be contained in Hurtado de la Vera's *Comedia intitulada d'el sueño d'el Mundo*, 1572. Parallel expressions are found in the several versions of the Duke of Burgundy anecdote, which in varied form is the basic element of Calderon's main plot. In Luis Vives' version reference is made to the *vita somnium*. Rojas, in his *Viage entretenido*, says, *veis aquí, amigo, lo que es el mundo, todo es un sueño*, and in the same author's play, *El natural desdichado*, in which the Duke of Burgundy anecdote was first dramatized in Spain, occur the lines:

"¿ Veis aquí lo que es el mundo?
Todo, amigos, es un sueño."

Finally, to cite only one non-peninsular use of the expression, the Pomeranian, Ludwig Halle, in 1605, published a dramatization of the same episode, entitled: "Sommium Vitæ Humanae das ist: Ein Newes Spiel darin aus einer lustigen Geschicht von Philippo Bono . . . Gleich in einem Spiegel gezeiget wird das vnser zeitlichs Leben mit all seiner Herrlichkeit nur ein nichtiger vnd betruglicher Traum sey . . ." But what is even more to the point, Lope in his *Barlán y Josafá*, dated 1611, when Calderon was eleven years of age, used very similar words:

"Dejé un perpétuo desvelo,
Dejé un sueño de la vida
Dejé una imagen fingida
Idolatrada del suelo . . ."

¹ *Enxemplo xxxviii.*

One may deduce the legitimate conclusions : (1) *dicen que nuestra vida* need not imply a reference to a contemporary comedia ; (2) had Calderon's play been written, and had Lope intended an allusion to it, he would not have used such a vague expression as "dicen"; (3) in view of the excellence of *La vida es sueño*, of its author's prominence by this time and of Lope's knowledge of all that his rival was producing, we may conclude, it seems, that the play in question had not been written, or, at least, had not appeared in print, or on the stage, by August 1, 1631. The only posterior date² that can be fixed with any degree of certainty is the date of the license of the first part of Calderon's plays, November 6, 1635.

Again, but by a somewhat complicated process, it may be shown that the anterior date of *La vida es sueño* is considerably subsequent to November 4, 1629. In *Primero soy yo* occurs the passage :

"¿Quién pensara que yo hiciera
Pasos de : La vida es sueño?"³

Primero soy yo is mentioned in *Basta collar*⁴; in the latter play allusion is probably made to *El galán Fantasma*. This last link is weak, but Schmidt's conjecture⁵ seems to be correct. *El galán Fantasma* is alluded to in *La dama duende*, which play, in turn, refers to the baptism of Prince Baltasar Carlos, November 4, 1629, and is the only work in the series that can be dated with certainty. Hartzenbusch's arguments, to show that *Basta collar* was written prior to 1635, are, of themselves, not conclusive.⁶

Prof. Lang has noted that a scene in *Life is a dream* has a parallel in Enciso's *El Príncipe Don Carlos*, licensed April, 1633. Dr. Schevill has discussed the suggestion at considerable length, concluding in favor of the priority of Enciso.⁷ His train of reasoning seems logical and his conclusion a just one, but until the dates of the two plays are determined beyond controversy, final

² I have refrained from making use of the *Loa sacramental de los títulos de las comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio*, of doubtful date and authorship. If, however, it is by Lope, then, as Prof. Marden suggests to me, we have a posterior date, the death of Lope August 27, 1635, reference being made in the *Loa* (l. 80) to Calderon's play.

³ Ed. Rivad., IV, 20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 256.

⁵ *Die S. Calderon's*, p. 107.

⁶ *Ibid.*, IV, 671.

⁷ *PMLA*, 1903, 204 ff.

judgment must be deferred.⁸ Granted that Calderon plagiarized in ninety-nine cases, nothing is proved for the hundredth. Even though the scene in Enciso's play harks back to the original history of Don Carlos, the parallel scene in *Life is a dream* is quite natural and dramatically appropriate. There is always a possibility that Enciso may have turned to Calderon's play when dramatizing the similar situation in the life of Prince Carlos.

* * * *

Stiefel has recently studied, with wonted thoroughness, the cloak episode in Lope's *El Honrado Hermano*.⁹ He suggests as a possible source, Timoneda's *El Sobremesa y Alivio de Caminantes*, and adds two shorter versions from Pinedo's *Liber facetiarum*, likewise, of the sixteenth century. Leite de Vasconcellos has since published a modern Portuguese version.¹⁰ The story occurs in another *libro de chistes*, Melchior de Sancta Cruz's *Floresta de apothegmas*, first published in 1574, and frequently afterwards, although the work is now exceedingly rare. Sancta Cruz's version is, in the main, like Timoneda's, but if Lope recurred to a printed text for his form of the episode, it was, if we may judge from the close, to Timoneda's. Sancta Cruz's version is as follows :

"Vn escudero fue a negociar con el Duque de Alua don N. y como no le diessen silla, quitose la capa, y assentose en ella. El Duque le mandó dar silla. Dixo el escudero : vuestra señoría perdóne mi mala crianza, que como estoy acostumbrado en mi casa de assentarme, desuanecioseme la cabeza. Como vuo negociado, saliose en cuerpo, sin cobijarse la capa. Trayendosela vn page, le dixo, seruios della, que à mi ya me ha seruidó de silla, y no la quiero lleuar mas acuestas."¹¹

* * * *

⁸ Since writing the above I have secured a copy of the 1774 edition, as, also, Schaeffer's translation of the play (Leipzig, 1887)—not consulted by Dr. Schevill. One needs must agree with Schaeffer's conjecture (p. 7), that one form of the play was written between 1621 and 1629.—Of the plays in Dr. Schevill's bibliographical list (p. 199) I have nos. 5 and 6 (two copies).

⁹ *ZRPh.*, 1905, 333.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 1906, 332.

¹¹ *Septima parte, capítulo primero*, No. xxvii, ed. Bruselas, 1629. See now, Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la Novela*, II, XLVI, n.

In his edition of *Ocho comedias desconocidas* (1887), Schaeffer published an anonymous play, *El Caballero de Olmedo*, in which the final words of leave-taking are :

"Carrero, Telles y Salas pide
perdonen Vs M ."

Schaeffer, remembering that the text is lamentably corrupt, and believing that three authors were referred to, changed *pide* to *piden*. He knew of no Telles, and no Carrero, but Salas might be Salas Barbadillo. Stiefel took exception to the emendation, for Spaniards often have three names.¹² At the same time he called attention to a dramatist Carrero, mentioned by Schack and Barrera. In his edition of Lope's play of the same title, Menéndez y Pelayo suggests the emendation *Claramonte pide*. Restori while reviewing the Spanish scholar's study,¹³ passes over the emendation, refers to the play as by *tres ingenios*, and adds : " *Ma non credo che i cappucciosi nomi di Carrero, Telles y Salas dei versi finali sieno di comici: Salas ve ne sono parecchi, ma ignoro vi fossero dei Carrero (nè Porto carrero) e di Tellez [!] trovo solo una Catalina nella compagnia del Balbin al 1º settembre 1629 . . .*"

Two considerations may be offered here ; if they do not solve the problem, they may, at least, be interesting in and for themselves. Critics have all been aware of the manuscript of the play, dated 1606. Through the kindness of Sr. Paz y Melia, it is possible to quote here the final lines :

"Oy Elvira se despide
de ti, y Morales pide
perdón, a vuestras mercedes."

It will be noticed that the lines differ from the Schaeffer text, and that Carrero, Telles and Salas are not mentioned at all. Morales may be Alonso de Morales, actor and playwright, but the name is a common one in the annals of the Spanish stage.

Returning to the Schaeffer version, printed probably before the end of the second decade of the seventeenth century, there were undoubtedly dramatists by the name of Carrero and Salas, and of course there was a Tellez. Gabriel wrote under the pseudonym Tirso de Molina, but there is

nothing whatsoever to preclude a reference to him by his real name ; Lope, for instance, referred to him as Tellez. That we should have the form Telles need cause no anxiety. The confusion is easily explained. In Barrera (585) will be found Tellos, for Tellez (de Meneses). In Claramonte's *Letania moral*, approved 1610, Tirso is referred to as Telles. This note will have served a purpose if it calls attention to the importance of Claramonte's work for the history of a most obscure and intricate period of Spanish literature. Up to the present only the *inquiridon de los ingenios invocados*, and the few *quintillas* cited by Gallardo have been used. In the *inquiridon* Tirso appears as fray Gabriel Tellez. Folio 364, in a poem to Sancte Raimon non nat, patron of childbirth, we read :

La lengua ò Ramon moued . . .
Mas si soy Merced por dos
Ramones, en las acciones
otro Ramon os da Dios
para que de tres Ramones
aya trinidad en vos.
El con inmortal decoro
Os cante, sino despierta
Telles su acento sonoro,
mas dexad que perlas vierta
por sus labios Pico de oro . . .

The Ramon alluded to is Alonso Ramon or Remon. Barrera says : " *El padre Remón debió de entrar en la religión Mercenaria poco antes del año de 1611.*"¹⁴ Now, as the *Letania moral* was approved May 23, 1610, it must be inferred that he had entered the order as early as 1608, or 1609.¹⁵ 'Pico de oro' was Fray Hernando de Santiago, identified as follows in *Mercurius Trimegis* . . . Patone 1621, fol. 165 : " *Todo esto es de Frai Hernando de Santiago, llamado por su bien decir Pico de oro.*"

* * * *

The *Caballero de Olmedo* was written in 1605 or 1606, as reference is made (p. 329) to Lope's *La Noche Toledana*, written after April 8, 1605. The only accessible text is unusually corrupt, and this ought to have saved it from the severe criticism which Lope's editor and apologist metes out

¹⁴ *Catálogo*, p. 316.

¹⁵ Remón was a *Mercenario* as early as 1605 ; cf. *Comedias de Tirso de Molino*, ed. Cotarelo y Mori, 1906, p. viii.

¹² *LBlGRPh.*, 1889, 309.

¹³ *ZRPh.*, 1905, 358.

to it. The subject is disagreeable in the extreme, reminding one of Kyd's *The Spanish Tragedie*. But the exposition of the constancy of Elvira and of the villainy of the English count is powerful. Certain parts would be a credit to even such a master as Tirso. It must be confessed, however, that the wing flags all too often. One might be pardoned for insisting upon the archaeological interest of the scene at the bull fight. How modern are the cries of the *aguador* and *frutero*!

"¡ Agua y anís, galanes : ¿ quién la bebe? . . .
¡ A ocho ciruelas regañona!
¡ Avellanas tostadas, caballeros!
¡ Oh qué rico turrón! Es de Alicante,
y lo doy á cincuenta y dos la libra . . ."

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

University of Toronto.

THE DATE OF COLERIDGE'S

MELANCHOLY.¹

Coleridge's "Melancholy: a Fragment," was printed in *Sibylline Leaves*, 1817, with the statement that it was "First published in the *Morning Chronicle*, in the year 1794." Campbell in the *Globe* edition gives that date, but with a question mark, adding that he "searched the *M. Ch.* of 1794 for the verses, but without success."

Two years after the *Globe* edition was published appeared Mr. E. H. Coleridge's two-volume collection of his grandfather's *Letters*, including many that had not before been printed. Among these is one from Coleridge to Wm. Sotheby, dated Aug. 26, 1802, which seems to confirm the early date of the verses, though another paper is named as the place of first publication. Coleridge is acknowledging the receipt of a volume of Bowles's poetry that Sotheby had sent him:

" . . . I well remember that, after reading your 'Welsh Tour,' Southey observed to me that you, I, and himself had all done ourselves harm

¹This note was written and sent to the Editors of *M.L.N.* before I knew that Mr. Coleridge had found the lines in the *Morning Post*. I have attempted to recast it in the proof,—not, I feel, very successfully.

by suffering an admiration of Bowles to bubble up too often on the surface of our poems. In perusing the second volume of Bowles, which I owe to your kindness, I met a line of my own which gave me great pleasure, from the thought what a pride and joy I should have had at the time of writing it, if I had supposed it possible that Bowles would have adopted it. The line is,—

Had melancholy mused herself to sleep.

I wrote the lines at nineteen, and published them many years ago in the 'Morning Post' as a fragment, and as they are but twelve lines, I will transcribe them :

Upon a mouldering abbey's broadest wall,
Where ruining ivies prop the ruins steep—
Her folded arms wrapping her tatter'd pall
Had Melancholy mused herself to sleep.
The fern was press'd beneath her hair,
The dark green Adder's Tongue was there;
And still as came the flagging sea gales weak,
Her long lank leaf bow'd fluttering o'er her cheek.
Her pallid cheek was flush'd; her eager look
Beam'd eloquent in slumber! Only wrought,
Imperfect sounds her moving lips forsook,
And her bent forehead work'd with troubled thought.

"I met these lines yesterday by accident, and ill as they are written there seemed to me a force and distinctness of image in them that were buds of promise in a schoolboy performance."

The expression "I met these lines yesterday by accident" and the indefiniteness of the date of publication ("many years ago") suggest that he had the fragment before him in the shape of an undated clipping from the *Morning Post* while he wrote. Guided perhaps by this suggestion, the editor of the *Letters* has since found the earliest known print of *Melancholy*—in the *Morning Post* for December 12, 1797.² The five years between 1797 and 1802 may well have seemed many to Coleridge. Bearing in mind the lapse of time, the established tendency of romantic poets in general

²E. H. Coleridge, "S. T. Coleridge as a Lake Poet," *Trans. of the Royal Society of Literature*, xxiv, 110. It had escaped the notice of Campbell, who had "not detected any of Coleridge's contributions to the *Morning Post* before the beginning of 1798"; and Dr. Haney in his Coleridge bibliography (1903) seems to have followed Campbell, listing *Fire, Famine and Slaughter*, Jan. 8, 1798, as Coleridge's first contribution to the *Post*.

and Coleridge in particular to assign early dates to their compositions, and the fact that Coleridge did print no less than ten poems in the *Chronicle* in 1794, we have probably a sufficient explanation of the assertion in *Sibylline Leaves* that the fragment was first printed in the *Chronicle* in 1794. 1797 is pretty certainly the date of the first appearance of *Melancholy*. The same year is also, notwithstanding what Coleridge wrote to Sotheby about the lines being a "schoolboy performance," the probable date of their composition.

The dating of so slight a fragment as *Melancholy* would not justify this lengthy note, even to a Coleridge student, were it not that the lines bear some internal evidence of belonging to a later period than Coleridge assigns them to,—to the most interesting and important period of his whole poetical career. The "fern," the "dark green Adder's Tongue," the "long lank leaf," are strongly suggestive of that ash-tree dell at Nether Stowey which made so deep an impression on the poet's imagination in the years 1796 and 1797. Professor Dowden has pointed out³ the chief instances of its appearance in Coleridge's verse,—in *This Lime Tree Bower my Prison*, in *Osorio*, and in *Fears in Solitude*. Copies of the first-named poem sent to Southey and Lloyd, in the summer of 1797, shortly after it was composed, describe the "plumey ferns" "sprayed by the waterfall"; in *Osorio* (composed the same summer) the plumey fern has become "the long lank weed," and so it appears in the printed form of *This Lime-Tree Bower*— "the dark green file of long lank weeds." The adder's tongue is not mentioned in any of these poems, but that the "ferns" and "weeds" mean the same plant that is named in *Melancholy* is shown by an entry in Dorothy Wordsworth's Journal (Feb. 10, 1798): "Walked to Woodlands, and to the waterfall. The adder's tongue and the ferns green in the low damp dell." It is further shown by two botanical notes. When Coleridge printed *This Lime-Tree Bower* in the *Annual Anthology* for 1800, he annotated l. 17 as follows :

"'Of long lank weeds.' The *Asplenium scolopendrium*, called in some countries the Adder's

³ "Coleridge as a Poet," *New Studies in Literature*, 313 ff.

tongue, in others the Hart's tongue: but Withering gives the Adder's tongue as the trivial name of the *Ophioglossum on'y.*"

This note was retained in *Sibylline Leaves*, and afterwards. In *Sibylline Leaves* also l. 7 of *Melancholy* has this note :

"A botanical mistake. The plant, I meant, is called the Hart's Tongue; but this would unluckily spoil the poetical effect. *Cedat ergo Botanice;*"

which is merely a modification of the note originally printed in the *Post*:

"A plant found on old walls, and in wells and moist edges.—It is often called the Hart's-tongue."⁴

There can be no doubt that, at least when this note was written, the "fern," the "dark green Adder's Tongue," and the "long lank leaf" of *Melancholy* were identified in Coleridge's mind with the "plumey ferns," the "dark green file of long lank weeds," that so impressed his imagination in the ash-tree dell at Nether Stowey. In view of the fact that no one has found the fragment in print earlier than December, 1797, we are I think justified in believing that *Melancholy* in the form in which we have it was not "a schoolboy performance," and that its "force and distinctness of image" are a product of the great year at Stowey.

This date accords also with Bowles's alleged borrowing mentioned in the letter to Sotheby. But as a matter of fact Bowles was probably thinking of another poem of Coleridge's rather than of *Melancholy*.

The passage to which Coleridge refers is in Bowles's *Coombe Ellen*:

"Here Melancholy, on the pale crags laid,
Might muse herself to sleep; or Fancy come,
Witching the mind with tender cozenage,
And shaping things that are not."

Coombe Ellen was "written in Radnorshire, September, 1798," and published the same year—

⁴ In the version of *This Lime-tree Bower* sent to Southey in July, 1797, Coleridge had already commented in a note on the "plumy ferns":—"The ferns that grow in moist places grow five or six together, and form a complete 'Prince of Wales's Feathers,'—that is, plumy."

a year after the appearance of Coleridge's fragment in the *Morning Post*. The resemblance is evident, and rather striking. "Pale Melancholy" has "sat retired" since Collins so stationed her in 1748, but she first "mused herself to sleep" in Coleridge's imagination.⁵ Not, however, for the first time in the fragment under consideration.

In the autumn of 1796 Coleridge and Lloyd spent a week with Poole at Nether Stowey, the result of which was a poem to Lloyd, published in the *Poems of 1797* under the title *To a Young Friend on his Proposing to Domesticate with the Author*. It is an enthusiastic description, very slightly allegorized, of the beauties of nature that will surround the poet and his disciple when they are settled at Stowey. The dell is not pictured sharply and definitely as it was to be later, in the poems of 1797-8, but it is a part of his recollection of the place, recurring more than once in the poem. And this poem it is that one constantly recalls while reading *Coombe Ellen*. In it are to be found almost all the concrete items of Bowles's description: the dashing torrent, the red berries of the ash, the sheep wandering on the perilous cliff, the towering crag. I should have to copy a large part of both poems to show all the relations and resemblances. Finally, in it occurs the very fancy that Coleridge mentions in the letter to Sotheby, and in the same language, save that a synonym is used:

"Calm Pensiveness might muse herself to sleep."

Here, then, is a sufficient Coleridgean antecedent for Bowles's line, indeed for his whole poem, in a piece he is rather more likely to have seen

⁵ Tho it was from Bowles, apparently, that he learned to feel a special delight in the verb *muse*. It is the best-loved word in Bowles's vocabulary, and became scarcely less a favorite with his young admirers the Pantocrats. It occurs five times in the first ten sonnets in Gilfillan's edition of Bowles, frequently in association with an evening landscape, a cliff or a hillside with a castle (cf. first two lines of *Melancholy*). It gave a name for Coleridge's *magnum opus* of those days, the *Religious Musings*; it comes in characteristically in the *Monody on the Death of Chatterton*; a sonnet of Lovell's quoted by Cottle (*Reminiscences*, p. 3, Amer. ed. of 1848) cannot avoid it; and Coleridge himself took occasion to ridicule it as a mannerism of the school in the first of the Higginbotham sonnets. It goes back of course to Collins's *Ode to Evening*.

than he is to have seen *Melancholy*, tho of course he may well enough have seen both. "About the 6th of September [1797]," says Campbell, "having completed *Osorio* to the middle of the fifth act, [Coleridge] took it over to Shaftesbury to exhibit it to the 'god of his idolatry, Bowles.'" This was his first meeting with the sonneteer. No doubt he took with him, if he had not already sent, a copy of the 1797 *Poems*; very likely he read to Bowles the lines *To a Young Friend, &c.*, very likely also the first draft of *This Lime-Tree Bower*, in connection with the scenes in *Osorio* in which the same material had been used. Coleridge was an impressive reader, especially of his own poetry. Bowles doubtless studied Coleridge's verse with enthusiasm after that meeting; and when, a year later, he found himself in Radnorshire in the midst of scenery such as Coleridge had celebrated, he imitated the lines to Lloyd in *Coombe Ellen*.

Melancholy, I believe, is no more a schoolboy performance than is *Time Real and Imaginary*. Very likely the fancy of Melancholy musing herself to sleep was early, a product of the time when Bowles was in the ascendent. It has no necessary connection with Stowey, tho as we have seen he introduced it into his first Stowey poem in 1796. But the lines he printed in the *Morning Post* in December, 1797, and sent to Sotheby in 1802 as a product of his nineteenth year, surely took shape not in 1791 or 1794, but after 1796—after he had seen the Quantocks, and the ash-tree dell in particular.

H. M. BELDEN.

University of Missouri.

OE. *werg*, *werig* 'ACCURSED'; *wergan* 'TO CURSE.'

The elder school of lexicographers, for example, Ettmüller, *Lex. An. Sax.*, p. 97, Bouterwek, *Ein An. sächs. Glossar.*, p. 297, Grein, *Sprachschatz*, ii, 662-3, treated *werg*, *werig*, *wergan*, &c., meaning 'accursed, to curse,' as having a short vowel. Also the Bosworth-Toller marks the vowel as short, although—unfortunately—entering *werg*, *werig*, *wyrig* under *wearg*. Kluge, *An.*

sächs. *Leseb.*³ enters *wyrgan*, verb, as short, but does not record the nominal form *werg*, *werig*; doubtless for him the vowel is short in all forms. Of late years, however, the practice has crept in of regarding the *e* as long and writing the lemma *wērig*; see Cook, *Christ*, p. 290, and Krapp, *Andrew*, p. 234. To whose doctrine this parallelling of *werg*, *werig* 'accursed' with *wērig* 'weary' may be due, I am unable to say; perhaps to the example of Sweet, who in his *Stud. Dict. of An. Sax.*, p. 205, enters *wērig**, ē†, y 'accursed.' Clark Hall, *Concise An. Sax. Dict.*, p. 365, col. *b* (near top), enters *wyrge* and (farther down) *wyrig*, both forms with short vowel. Now, although Clark Hall is unjustifiable in his *wyrge* with final *-e*, and although the Bosworth-Toller is absurd in entering *werg*, *werig* under *wearg*, nevertheless the phonology of Ettmüller, Bouterwek, Grein, namely *wērg*, *wērig*, is right and the *wērig* of Cook and Krapp and the *wērg* of Sweet are flatly wrong. See the passing remark by Cosijn, *Beitr. xx*, 109–110. Concerning Krapp in particular, I have grounds for suspecting that his personal belief is against *wērig*.

Every investigation of the question should start from the familiar *warg*, Icel. *vargr*, OE. (WS.) *wearg*, OS. *warag*. The ultimate relations of Germanic *warg-s* have been fully discussed by Kauffmann, *Beitr. xviii*, 175–187. I have not space for even the briefest résumé of Kauffmann's exposition. Let it suffice to say that a *warg-s* was a person who had committed an inexpiable offence, a parricide, who was solemnly thrust out of the community and handed over to the punishment of the gods. The 'wolf' (werwolf) is a Scandinavian development. In OE. the word was reduced to mean a miserable one in general, a wretch to be shunned and execrated. Hence the gothic verb *ga-wargjan* 'to condemn, curse,' OE. *wiergan*, *wergan*.

What, then, is the explanation of the OE. nominal forms *werg*, *werig*, &c.? That the Bosworth-Toller is wrong in equating them with *wearg*, the breaking of *warg*, will be evident to one looking more closely into the phonology of the so-called breakings. In OE. the broken vowel begins palatal and ends guttural; of necessity consonants after the vowel are also in the guttural position. The clearest utterance on this

point is found in Bülbring, *Altengl. El.buch*, § 139:

"Die Brechung hat ihren Grund in der vela-ren, und wenigstens z. T. vielleicht auch labialen, Artikulation bezw. Nebenartikulation, welche den brechenden Konsonanten eigen war: x [Bülbring's sign for the OE. *h* velar spirant § 480] war jedenfalls auch nach *e* und *i* velar und ähnelte wohl der hinteren Varietät, die heutzutage z. B. von Schweizern (in *iach* 'ich') gesprochen wird; das lange sowohl als das gedeckte *r* wurde mit Hebung der Hinterzunge und vielleicht mit Lippenrundung gesprochen; ebenso das aus dem Urgerm. stammene *ll* und das gedeckte *l*, soweit sie Brechung hervorriefen, d. h. also wie ne. *ll* in *hall*, *full*."

From this it is clear that a velar or labial (non-palatal) breaking *r* in the combination *rg*, *rh*, could not have evolved a parasitic palatal vowel between the *r* and the *g* or *h*. See Sievers, § 213, Anm. on *byrig* (**burgi*) and *burug*. Conversely, if *-rg-*, *-rh-* is non-palatal, the parasitic vowel will also be non-palatal, an *a*, *o*, *u*; this we find in OS. *warag*. According to the Bosworth-Toller assumption: *werg*, *werig* = *wearg*, we should expect such forms as **werug*, **werag*. Yet these are precisely the forms which we never find; we encounter only forms of the *-rig-* type, e. g., *weriga*, *weriges*, *werigra*, *werigum*, *wyrigra*. Especially significant are such forms as *se werga feond*, *Bede* 216/2 (*wer'a* ms. B, Miller, II, p. 230), *þa wergan gastas*, 214/16 (*wérian* ms. B, Miller, II, p. 229). Too much importance need not be attached to the accent in *wérian*. In a text so tangled up and fitful as the OE. *Bede* accent-writing must be of the slightest conceivable significance; see *úanalyfedre*, 110/25 (ms. B, Miller, II, p. 101). The accent in *wérian* can indicate nothing more than a late OE. lengthening (sporadic) in open syllable, Sweet, *H. E. S.* § 392. Of far greater significance is the phenomenon that the reduction of *werigan* to *werian*, of *weriga* to *weria* marks the extreme palatalization of *g* in the direction of the *y*-sound.

If *werg* is not = *wearg*, what then is it? Only one explanation suggests itself to me, namely, to assume a stem **wargi-* parallel with the more usual *warg-o-s*. This **wargi-* would produce OE. *werg*, *wierg*, *wyrg* in accordance with the familiar principles of OE. phonology, while *werig*, *wyrig*,

&c., are merely the same forms with palatal parasitic vowel, like *byrg*, *byrig* from **burgi*. Clark Hall's *wyrge*, however, with final -e in the lemma, runs counter to Sievers, §§ 133, 269, 302.

On the negative side one has a right to call upon the upholders of the **wērig* form for some explanation. What can be the etymology of **wērig* 'accursed'? OE. ē, apart from a very few words like the adverb *hēr*, is the *i*-Umlaut of ō or of ēa, ēo. Now, if there are such stems as *wōr-* (or *wēor-*, *wēar-*) -*ig*, assuredly they have left no trace. Why Sweet in particular should enter *wērig** (in his phonology ī is the *i*-Umlaut of ēa, ēo) yet enter the verb *wiergan* (*i*-Umlaut of ea, eo) is a puzzle. In what Ablaut relation are ea, eo, ēa, ēo? Whereas *warg-o-* and **warg-i-* fit into the OE. vowel system without a wrench. For the connection between *warg-* and Latin *virga*, *virgula*, see Kauffmann; the 'twig' was attached to the neck of the parricide as a symbol and badge.

A few words upon the metrical aspects of **wērig* versus *werg*. A hemistich of the type **fēond | wērigne* or **wērigne | fēond* would point conclusively to **wērig*. But there is no such hemistich; the reader may satisfy himself by consulting Grein. There is not a line in OE. poetry which compels us to scan **wērig*; on the contrary, *wērig* is the almost unavoidable scansion. For example, *wērige mid wērigum*, Andrew 615a; read either: *wērige mid | wērigum* or *wērige mid | wērigum*, as unmistakably preferable to *wērige mid | wērīgum*, which—according to Sievers, *Alt-germ. Metrik*, § 78.5—we should stress: *wērige mid | wērīgum*.

A final word of correction. The Bosworth-Toller cites *Genesis* 906 under *wērig* 'accursed,' although more than twenty years ago Sievers, *Beitr. x*, 512, corrected the ms. *werg* to *wērig*. It will be well to examine the passage in full:

þu scealt wideferhð wērig þinum
breostum bearm tredan bradre eorðan, &c.

The emendation *bradre* for the ms. *brade* is by Dietrich, *Zs. f. d. Alt. x*, 318. Properly interpreted, the passage means: 'Thou (the serpent) shalt all thy life weary on thy breast(s) tread the lap of the broad earth.' This is fairly equivalent to: 'Upon thy belly shalt thou go,' *Gen. III*, 14.

J. M. HART.

Cornell University.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *PERICLES*, V, 1, 1-101.

It is now almost universally admitted that, with the possible exception of a few scattered phrases, the first two acts of *Pericles* are not from Shakspere's hand. The last three, however, seem to reveal his mind and art at nearly every point. Even the repulsive scenes in the brothel were probably revised and in part rewritten by the master, with the especial purpose of glorifying Marina's character. No scene save these,¹ in Acts III-V, has hitherto been challenged.

There is, nevertheless, at least one passage of considerable length—the first hundred lines of the fifth act—which may well awaken suspicion. It shows surprising poverty of style and thought if compared with the portions immediately preceding and following, and betrays, furthermore, some important inconsistencies which demand explanation. One of these is something of which it is difficult to believe that Shakspere could have been guilty. He is careful to represent Marina as a model of young womanhood, and so well does he succeed that she is not unworthy to be placed beside those wonderful creations of his best plays—Imogen, Hermione, Cordelia, for example. Now Marina, like Cordelia, is attractive in no small degree by reason of her modesty; yet in the passage under suspicion she is given a speech which is wholly out of accord with this modesty:

"I am a maid,
My lord, that ne'er before invited eyes,
But have been gazed on like a comet."

If this is Shakspere's touch, the only remaining theory is that her character is drawn in a glaringly inconsistent fashion. And this I believe to be next to impossible, for in 1608 (the year in which *Pericles* was probably staged) he was in the full maturity of his genius.

Another inconsistency is concerned with Marina's occupation. It was first noted by Mr. F. G. Fleay (*A Shakespeare Manual*, p. 210), who, however, did not deny Shakspere's authorship of the passage:

"She is all happy as the fairest of all,
And with her fellow maids is now upon
The leafy shelter that abuts against
The island's side." (v, 1, 49-52.)

¹ The Gower prologues, or choruses, however, are admittedly non-Shaksperean.

In iv, 6, she is represented as desirous to "sing, weave, sew and dance," in order to earn money for the bawd in whose power she has been placed. And in the prologue to Act v she is taking pupils in singing, dancing, and embroidering :

"And her gain
She gives the cursed bawd."

Now it is true that Shakspere was sometimes careless concerning such details, but it is probable that in this case the mistake was a result of an attempt to graft parts of two different versions of the play.

Such an attempt is again suggested by the fact that the proper name, Mytilene, is not pronounced in the same manner in the hundred lines under suspicion as in the other portions. In v, 1, 43, it is Mýtilén, as is shown by the meter, whereas in line 177 of the same scene—almost certainly a Shaksperean passage—it has the ordinary pronunciation, the final e being sounded. In the closing couplet of the Gower prologue, or chorus, to iv, 5, the pronunciation is again Mýtilén, as is proved not only by the meter but also by the rime and the quarto spelling :

"Patience, then,
And think you now are all in Mytilene."
(Quarto, Mittelin.)

All the choruses are admittedly non-Shaksperean. We may expect, therefore, to find this shortened form once more ; and in the prologue to v, 3, we do find it :

"What minstrelsy and pretty din,
The regent made in Mytilene."
(Quarto, Metalin.)

It is true that Shakspere occasionally used two forms of the same word, for metrical reasons (*Desdemona* and *Désdemón*) ; but it can hardly be shown that he does so here, for the full list of examples enables one to make this statement : in the (probably) non-Shaksperean portions we have the trisyllable only, four times (iv, 4, 51 ; v, 1, 3 ; v, 1, 43 ; v, 2, 273) ; in Shakspere's portion, the quadrисyllable only, also four times (v, 1, 177 ; v, 1, 188 ; v, 1, 221 ; v, 3, 10). In two of these Shaksperean lines it is possible to scan the word as a trisyllable, but the other scansion is the more natural. Furthermore, it is significant that the long pronunciation does not occur even once in the non-Shaksperean lines ; and this must be

explained. The burden of proof would seem to rest upon those who believe Shakspere to be the author of v, 1, 1-101. Though not in itself final, the inconsistency strikingly corroborates the other kinds of evidence.

Further proof is afforded by a curious break after line 84 in this first scene of the fifth act. When Pericles exclaims "Hum, ha !" he shows extreme anger. Othello uses the same words (separately) in his most highly wrought states. Apparently, then, Pericles follows these exclamations with a blow ; for Gower,² Twine,³ and Wilkins's novel⁴ all mention it, the two last named adding Marina's lamentations. Both stage-direction and text seem to have dropped out. The gap must be one of several lines, since Marina's first words, in the play as we now have it, show no lament or agitation. That there was a blow, nevertheless, is shown by the question which Pericles asks, a few lines beyond (v, 1, 127-130) :

"Didst thou not say, when I did push thee back—
Which was when I perceived thee—that thou camest
From good descending?"

And at another point, this time in the (probably) non-Shaksperean portion (v, 1, 100-101), Marina herself says :

"My lord, if you did know my parentage,
You would not do me violence."

How shall we reconcile these statements with the absence of a stage-direction ? It is possible that it is merely a careless omission, and that ten or fifteen lines of dialogue have also perished ; for the text of the whole play is hopelessly corrupt. But it is also possible that here again is an example of the attempt to graft one version upon another. At any rate, the several kinds of evidence presented, when taken as a whole, may well give us pause.

HARRY T. BAKER.

Beloit College.

² *Confessio Amantis (Appolinus the Prince of Tyre)*, Circ. 1393.

³ *The Patterne of Painfull Adventures*. Laurence Twine, 1576.

⁴ *The Painfull Adventures of Pericles, Prince of Tyre. Being the true History of the Play of Pericles, as it was lately presented, etc.* 1608.

FÜRBERECHEN :

WALTHER VON DER VOGELWEIDE 105-14
(WILMANNS³).

In this well known *Spruch*, the poet champions the cause of the Landgrave Hermann of Thuringia. In the face of the accusations of the latter's enemies and quite regardless of the double-handed nature of the political game played by Hermann in his attitude to the imperial throne, Walther here urges upon Otto's attention the fairness of treatment accorded by Hermann to his imperial opponent. For the Thuringian fights in the open. He is no coward. *Die zagen truogen stillen rät : Sie swuoren hie, sie swuoren dort und pruoften ungetriuwen mort.*

In view of Walther's enthusiastic defense of Hermann the meaning of the first three lines of this *Spruch*, which has hitherto been in doubt, seems to the present writer clear. The lines are :

*Nū sol der Keiser hēre
fürberechen durch sin ère
des lautgräven missetät.*

Franz Pfeiffer offers this comment upon the word *fürberechen* : " *fürberechen* bedeutet als trans. zum Vorschein, ans Licht bringen ; hier jedoch kann der Sinn des Wortes, wenn nicht Verderbnis vorliegt, nur sein : *nachlassen, nachsehen*. Bechstein schlägt vor (Germ. xii, 476) *vergessen*" ; Wilmanns echoes this view in his edition of the poet's works, p. 364, footnote 14, where he says : *fürberechen*, Lexer im Mhd. Wb. 3, 585 erklärt : ' herauskommen machen, offenbaren,' gegen den Sinn, wie der Zusammenhang zeigt. Wir erklärten früher unter Verweisung auf Gr. 4, 862, 868 *fürberechen* als gleichbedeutend mit *brechen für des lanträven missetät*, über dieselbe hinausgehen, darüber hingehen. Paul (Beitr. 2, 553) wandte ein, dasz *für* keine untrennbare Verbindung mit dem Verbum eingehen könne, wie sie angenommen werden müsse, wenn der erforderliche Sinn herauskommen solle ; er verlangt, dasz man *verbrechen* lese, spricht sich aber über den Sinn nicht aus." Wilmanns then adds that *übeltät verbrechen* occurs in the Passional (*Hahn* S. 218, 25) with the meaning *punish* (*strafen*). But he adds that this meaning is out of place in

case of Walther's *Spruch*, and ventures the conjecture that the poet used a technical hunting term (*Weidmannswort*) here. He explains that the hunters *verbrechen* the trail of an animal, by sticking a twig into the ground, as a sign that others are to refrain from pursuing the game (cf. *Laber*, str. 69). The poet's meaning would be, then, according to Wilmanns, a plea that the Emperor should act the part of huntsman and yield no further to accusations against the Landgrave.

While this is ingenious, it is not convincing, in view of the fact that it disregards two serious difficulties. First, the mss. have *fürberechen* not *verbrechen* ; second, the normal meaning of what the mss. contain is, at least more consonant with the situation in question than is any other thus far suggested. For Walther's zeal as a champion of Hermann is here so great that he begins his *Spruch* by a regular challenge for the Emperor to prove or make clear (*fürberechen*) the heinousness of the Thuringian's actions. "For," he adds at once, "he was an honorable (open, above-board) opponent."

*"Wand er was doch zewâre
sin vient offenbâre."*

The cowards intrigued in silence. They (like the Duke of Bavaria and the Margrave Dietrich) pledged themselves by oath in all directions and plotted secret mischief. The case against them is clear ; but let the Emperor show wherein the open hostility of Hermann was anything but honorable difference of opinion. This is the argument of Walther, and in the light of it Lexer's definition of *fürberechen* seems adequate.

Walther meets us here, not as the humble apologist for the acknowledged misdeeds of the Landgrave, but as the outspoken vindicator of his friend's integrity. The proposed interpretation bears strong incidental testimony to the independent attitude of the poet towards current politics. Its implications for the character of Walther are far more important than its bearing upon the meaning of the word *vürberechen*.

STARR WILLARD CUTTING.

The University of Chicago.

ROBERT GREENE'S *WHAT THING IS LOUE?*

In view of the fact that Mr. John Churton Collins in his recent *Plays and Poems of Robert Greene* has said nothing of the poem *What thing is Loue?* (except to refer the reader to Shakespeare's *Sonnets*, 129), I wish to point out the somewhat interesting history of the poem.

It first appeared in Greene's *Menaphon* (1589) as follows:¹

What thing is Loue? It is a power diuine
That raines in vs : or else a wreakfull law
That doomes our mindes, to beautie to encline :
It is a starre, whose influence dooth draw
Our heart² to Loue dissembling of his might,
Till he be master of our hearts and sight.

Loue is a discord, and a strange diuorce
Betwixt our sense and reason, by whose power,
As madde with reason, we admit that force,
Which wit or labour neuer may deuoure.
It is a will that brooketh no consent :
It would refuse, yet neuer may repent.

Loue's a desire, which for to waite a time,
Dooth loose an age of yeeres, and so doth passe,
As doth the shadow seuerd from his prime,
Seeming as though it were, yet never was.
Leauing behinde nought but repentant thoughts
Of daies ill spent, for that which profits nougts.

Its³ now a peace, and then a sodaine warre,
A hope consumde before it is conceiued,
At hand it feares, and menaceth afarre,⁴
And he that gaines, is most of all deceiued :
It is a secret hidden and not knowne,
Which one may better feele than write vpon.

The poem next appears in *England's Parnassus*, or *The Choyest Flowers of our Moderne Poets* (1600), p. 172. It had lost the first stanza, had two new lines substituted at the end, and had been otherwise slightly changed. But, most interesting of all, it was attributed to the Earl of Oxford. This attribution seems not to have been questioned since then. In the *Theatrum Poetarum*⁵ the poem is given as a specimen of Oxford's verse. Dr. Grossart included it in his collective edition of Oxford's poems.⁶ Even Mr.

¹ I follow the reprints of Arber and of Grosart, which agree throughout. Mr. Collins's version of the poem, though reproducing the same 1589 edition, differs slightly.

² "hearts"—Collins.

³ "Tis"—Collins.

⁴ "a farre"—Collins.

⁵ Edition 1800, p. 88.

⁶ *Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies' Library*, iv.

Sidney Lee, in *The Dictionary of National Biography*, although he refers to the three poems in *England's Parnassus* attributed to Oxford, does not note the mistake. The version of the poem in *England's Parnassus* is as follows:⁷

Loue is a discord and a strange diuorce
Betwixt our sence and rest, by whose power,
As mad with reason, we admit that force,
Which wit or labour neuer may diuorce.

It is a will that brooketh no consent,
It would refuse, yet neuer may repent.

Loue's a desire, which for to waight a time,
Doth loose an age of yeares, and so doth passe,
As doth the shadow seuerd from his prime,
Seeming as though it were, yet neuer was.

Leauing behind, nought but repentant thoughts,
Of dayes ill spent, of that which profits nougts.

It's now a peace, and then a sudden warre,
A hope, consumde before it is concei'd ;
At hand it feares, and menaceth afarre,
And he that gaines, is most of all decei'd.

Loue whets the dullest wits, his plagues be such,
But makes the wise by pleasing, dote as much.

The poem appeared again, in a still further mangled form, in *The Thracian Wonder*. The playwright, of course, borrowed directly from Greene, for he was dramatising the *Menaphon*.⁸ This version is as follows⁹

Love is a law, a discord of such force,
That 'twixt our sense and reason makes divorce ;
Love's a desire, that to obtain betime,
We lose an age of years pluck'd from our prime ;
Love is a thing to which we soon consent,
As soon refuse, but sooner far repent.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.
Cornell University.

THE STAGEABILITY OF GARNIER'S TRAGEDIES.

Of all the classic tragedies of the sixteenth century none perhaps seem to us moderns so little adapted to stage representation as those of Garnier. Lanson admits that the poet seems to write for the

⁷ Since *England's Parnassus* is inaccessible to me, I give the poem as reprinted by Dr. Grosart in *Poems of Edward, Earl of Oxford (Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies' Library, iv)*, p. 68.

⁸ See *Modern Philology*, iii, 317.

⁹ *The Dramatic Works of John Webster*, ed. by William Hazlitt, iv, 129.

reader only and finds little to warrant us in believing that his tragedies were played to any extent, except possibly *Bradamante*.¹ As for Rigal, he is of course quite convinced that these tragedies were not written for the stage at all and finds some difficulties that hardly exist to prove his point.

The first of the Garnier tragedies is the *Poreie*, published in 1568. The subject of the play is the self-inflicted death of Portia, wife of Brutus, upon learning of the death of her husband on the battlefield. The play is made up of long narratives and monologues and contains little, very little, of dramatic life, but after all, in view of the literary and artistic conditions of the time, that does not justify us in saying that the poet has no care for scenic possibilities.² The play is stageable, Rigal's objections to the contrary notwithstanding. One of the two chief difficulties insisted upon by him is the appearance of Antony and his lieutenant along with a chorus of soldiers in the third act before the messenger has had time to relate to Portia the death of Brutus, "Le lieu adû changer," he says, "nous étions à Rome avec Octavie et les femmes romaines, nous voici près de Philippe avec M. Antoine et ses troupes" (*op. cit.*, p. 27). This amounts almost to a misrepresentation, for the text makes it perfectly clear that this scene is laid in Rome. Antony's first words are :

O Beau seiour natal esmerueillable aux Dieux v. 1013.

and a little farther on, vv. 1027-1030,

Ie reuoy maintenant ma desirable terre.
Ie viens payer les veux, qu'envelopé de guerre,
Sous la mercy du sort, ie fis à vos autels,
Si ie pouuois domter les ennemis mortels.

He is, then, just returning to Rome, and the unity of place is saved. To introduce an act containing these discussions between the forebodings of Portia and their realization is not perhaps according to the highest dramatic economy. But the poet was young ; a tragedy had to have five acts ; Megara's forecast ; Portia's presentiments ; the messenger's story of the death of Brutus, and the nurse's story of the death of Portia furnished material for only four. To have inserted this act of rather irrelevant material anywhere else would have been even

more disastrous ; accordingly the poet put it where it would do the least harm, leaving the spectators as well as his readers to assume, if they chose, that Antony, the soldiers and the messenger came by the same boat, or more likely hoping that the clumsiness of it all would escape their attention—if it did not his own.

The other great difficulty in the way of stage representation, *i. e.*, dramatic probability raised by Rigal, is the alleged discrepancy between the words of the nurse and those of her mistress in the fourth act. In this act the messenger gives a complete account of the battle, the death of Brutus and the bringing back of his body at the command of Antony. Thereupon after a hundred verses or so Portia begins to address her complaints to the body as though it were actually upon the stage, although nothing in the text indicates precisely how or when it got there. But after all this is no great difficulty and the verses even lend themselves to a fairly effective stage-setting. Now in the fifth act when the nurse is relating the occurrences of the fourth to the chorus she says : v. 1880,

Quand ma paure maitresse
Eut ENTENDU que Brute, auecque la noblesse
Qui combatoit pour luy dvn si louable cuer,
Auoit esté desfaict, et qu'Antoine vainqueur
Lui renuoyoit son corps, qu'à grand' sollicitude
Il auoit recherché parmi la multitude :
Apres force regrets qu'elle fit sur sa mort,
Apres qu'elle eut long temps ploré son triste sort,
Retiree en sa chambre, entreprit, demy-morte
De borner ses langueurs par quelque briefue sorte.

Note. Even these last four verses give difficulty to Rigal, although the first two are a perfectly literal and brief description of what happened in the fourth act, and the last two will be supplemented in the narrative which is to follow, v. 1890 ff. In regard to these verses Rigal exclaims triumphantly : "Décidément la nourrice n'a pas vu le corps de Brutus ; elle ne s'est même pas aperçue que sa maîtresse fut en proie à une hallucination" (*op. cit.*, p. 26). There is little occasion for such a remark ; the nurse says that Portia had HEARD these things ("eut entendu"), and so she had throughout 146 verses. That Portia's preoccupation is the body of her husband, which she SAW, is quite natural ; that the nurse should be more impressed by the account of the catastrophe which she HEARD rather than with the dead body of Brutus, is also

¹ *Rev. d'Hist. Litt.*, 1903, p. 416.

² *Rev. d'Hist. Litt.*, 1904, p. 27.

entirely natural, and there is therefore absolutely no infringement of dramatic probabilities in the passage in question.

Poreie could well have been played upon a stage representing the conventional street or open space in front of the palace of Portia, the palace of Octavius, and possibly the senate. Had the poet the proper means at his disposal, and he might hope to have them as we have shown (*The Mise en Scène of the Italians applied to the classic tragedies of the sixteenth century*, p. 8), one extremity of the stage could well have been made to represent the harbor. Here Antony and his soldiers would appear in the third act on their way to the palace of Octavius or the Senate, and in the next act the messenger would be seen passing on his way to tell Portia of her great bereavement.

The text contains at least two indications of the action : one in the second act (v. 465), where the nurse perceives Portia approaching :—

Las ! mais ne voyé-ie pas s'acheminer vers moy
La fille de Caton regorgeante d'esmoy ?

Eight verses later Portia appears. And in the beginning of the last act the nurse calls to the chorus of citizens, v. 1794 :—

Accourez Citoyens, accourez, hastez-vous, etc.,

and the chorus of women respond :—

Allons ô troupe aimée, allons voir quel mechef
Ceste pauvre maison atterre de rechef.

From a modern point of view there can be little question of dramatic effect in this tragedy. The long speeches, some of them without any apparent connection with the action of the play are as undramatic as possible to us, but not necessarily so to the poets and the select audiences of the sixteenth century. Corneille, speaking of the monologue in *Clitandre*, plead in excuse of its length :—" Les monologues sont trop longs et trop fréquents en cette pièce ; c'était une beauté en ce temps-là ; les comédiens les souhaitaient et croyaient y paraître avec plus d'avantage." In the sixteenth century that was even more true, and not merely the actors, such as there were, but especially the poets, were fond of these monologues and believed—" y paraître avec plus d'avantage."

After the *Poreie* an interval of nearly five years elapses before Garnier produces another play.

This interruption,—due possibly to discouragement, as there is no notice of the representation of the *Poreie*,—is broken in 1573 and 1574 by two plays, the *Hippolyte* and the *Cornélie*. The first of these is composed in close imitation of the *Phedra*, attributed to Seneca, and can hardly be considered playable. In the fifth act, for example, the messenger tells Theseus of the death of his son and urges him to erect a befitting tomb ; in the very next scene Phèdre appears addressing complaints to the body of the hero, which is represented as already lying in the tomb. As for the *Cornélie*, while it contains nothing absolutely unstageable, it is composed in a way to make one agree with Rigal that " il n'y a que de la rhétorique ou de la poésie désordonnée et un manque de réalité scénique peu contestable."

Now, after the *Cornélie*, there is another significant pause of about four years before the poet begins a series of plays which appear quite regularly at the rate of about one per annum : *Antoine*, 1579 ; *Antigone*, 1580 ; *Bradamante*, 1582 ; *Les Juives*, probably in 1583.

As for the *Antoine*, Rigal finds in it : " Quelques indications précises " (*op. cit.*, p. 33), but believes that they were such as would have been naturally suggested by Plutarch's life of Antony, which Garnier used as a source (p. 33). This, of course, proves nothing as to the author's intention. Alexandre Hardy, for example, dramatized the Greek romance of Theagenes and Chariclea, as well as sundry other romances ancient and modern, and there can be no doubt that he had the *mise en scène* very much in mind. The *Antoine* could have been played, according to Rigal, on a stage representing the camp of Octavius outside of Alexandria, the palace of Cleopatra and the approaches and interior of the sepulchre, but he believes that such a *mise en scène* was quite beyond the reach of those who prepared the representations of these plays. Now this is again a magnification of the difficulties, for the text nowhere calls for the palace of Cleopatra. In the second act, where the queen and her attendants appear for the first time, the scene is laid before the sepulchre as is clear from her own words, v. 687 f. :

Mais ce pendant entrons en ce sepulcre morne,
Attendant que la mort mes desplaisances borne.

She appears but once more and that is in the fifth act where, as before, she is in or at the entrance of the tomb, v. 1812 :

Hé puis-je viure encore
En ce larval sepulchre, où je me fais enclore ?

The stage setting thus becomes very simple. Alexandria in the background, before the wall of which would be represented at one end of the stage the camp of Octavius, and on the other the tomb and its approaches.

In the *Troade*, Rigal also finds that the first, third, fourth and fifth acts possess "un incontestable réalité scénique" (*op. cit.*, p. 36 f.). But, alas ! the fourth is entirely out of harmony with the second. Now this is the whole difficulty : In the fourth act a messenger relates to the captive Trojan women the death of Astyanax who, fore-stalling the action of the Greeks, cast himself down from the lofty tower to which he had been carried. This had taken place before a vast concourse of people, some of whom had sacrilegiously climbed upon Hector's tomb to witness the execution. Now, inasmuch as the deed could be witnessed from Hector's tomb, and inasmuch as the action of the second act was laid before said tomb, Rigal, apparently feeling that Andromaque was bound to remain rooted to the spot during the third act, declares : "Cette fois nous heurtons à une impossibilité évidente." But the scene of the fourth act is laid before the tent of Hecuba (cf. v. 2295 ff.) near the harbor, and Andromaque is there to hear with her mother the death of Astyanax and of Polyxène from the lips of the messenger. One quite naturally supposes that after the wily Ulysses has succeeded in wringing from the unhappy mother the secret of her son's concealment in his father's tomb she has come away ; she has left the tomb of her husband and come to her mother's tent as was eminently natural. Accordingly she did *not* see the immolation of her son and there is no contradiction, no "impossibilité scénique" whatever.

(*Note.* The rather abrupt change of scene in the third act, while abrupt, is quite within stage conventions. Pyrrhus uses five verses to stir up the zeal of his followers as they march from the camp of Agamemnon to the tent of Hecuba in order to seek for Polyxène. Plenty of examples could be found in support of such procedure.)

As for the *Antigone* (1580), Rigal admits that if : "On voulait mettre en scène Antigone sur un théâtre disposé comme celui de Hardy, on y arriverait sans difficulté sérieuse" (*op. cit.*, p. 41). He believes, however, that it is to be looked upon merely as "un pur exercice d'humaniste" (45).

The *Bradamante* is known to have been played, and in it Garnier seems to show some preoccupation for the *mise en scène* as has generally been recognized (cf. Rigal, *op. cit.*, p. 46 ; Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 416).

And this brings us to *Les Juives*, the last of Garnier's tragedies and generally considered to be the best. Rigal admits in this play that the poet : "ne manquait pas d'imagination visuelle et se figurait assez souvent les personnages qu'il faisait parler" ; still he thinks that this tragedy : "n'était pas encore pour lui une œuvre de théâtre vivant d'une vie nette dans un milieu scénique bien déterminé" (*op. cit.*, p. 209). To prove this Rigal finds a great many difficulties in the way of stage presentation which seem to me entirely imaginary.

The stage would represent three general divisions. One side the fields where the women and children are kept captive ; the center the palace, or the entrance to the palace, of Nebuchadnezzar ; the other end of the stage the prisons, where are confined Zedekiah the pontiff, and perhaps other male prisoners. The places occupied by the captives are quite clearly defined in the text. Hammulat says, addressing the chorus of Jewish women, "Pleurons donc, pleurons sur ces molles rives" (v. 359) ; as the queen of Assyria comes towards them she speaks of the surroundings as "Ces belles campagnes" (v. 571) ; obviously the fields along the banks of the Euphrates. Zedekiah describes his place of imprisonment in these terms, v. 1283 f. :

Voyez comme enchainez en des prisons obscures,
Nous souffrons iour et nuit de cruelles tortures,
Comme on nous tient en serre estroitement liez,
Le col en vne chaisne, et les bras et les pieds.

It is in these places that the second and third scenes of the second act, and the whole of acts four and five are laid. The first act might from its character take place anywhere and the rest of the play would be represented before the king of Assyria.

At the end of the fourth act Nebuchadnezzar visits Zedekiah in prison and at the end of a violent scene bursts into a passion and exclaims to his attendants, "Empoignez-le, Soudars, et le tirez d'ici," v. 1497. Zedekiah defies him to do his worst and is rewarded with the promise of an exemplary punishment. Rigal makes a great difficulty of this. "Pourquoi tireraient-on Sédecie hors de sa prison?" (*op. cit.*, p. 207), "pourquoi veut-il qu'on les amène et qu'on les entraîne jusqu'à lui puisqu'ils sont enchaînés à ses pieds." But this is made perfectly clear with the opening of the next scene in which the Prevost informs us that Zedekiah has been taken from his prison in order that he be forced to see his sons put to death before his eyes. The presence of the chorus after Zedekiah has been removed from the prison is also a source of great trouble to Rigal, for how could these Jewish women be in the prison and not know what had happened? As a matter of fact, there is nothing in the chorus referring to the Jewish king, but there is, as if to remind us of the locality, another reference to those shores of the Euphrates where the chorus will end its life sighing in captivity. (Cf. v. 1557 ff.) There would certainly be no great strain of the conventions at this point, and the whole passage, far from being confused as Rigal represents, is, on the contrary, quite clear, and the stage picture is not difficult to form. As for the objection that different characters recite from twenty to thirty verses on the stage before their presence is perceived or before they perceive the presence of others; that is a common practice of modern dramatists, and a convention no more abused by Garnier than it is, for example, by Molière.

Les Juives is a tragedy full of life and action. There is doubtless too much action, but every verse of it could have been acted on a stage such as we have described and acted effectively, too, without any great violence to the conventions as then understood. As far as the play itself is concerned, there is no reason why we must look upon it as a "déclamation dramatique et dialoguée." And likewise to a greater or less extent are all of the tragedies of Garnier playable, or were playable, with the probable exception of *Hippolyte* and *Cornélie*, which stand somewhat apart from the others in time as well as in character.

COLBERT SEARLES.

Leland Stanford Jr. University.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

Primera Crónica General ó sea Estoria de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289; publicada por RAMÓN MENÉNDEZ PIDAL. Tomo I—Texto. Madrid: Bailly Bailliére é Hijos, 1906. 8vo., iv + 776 pp.

This volume, which forms number five of the *Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, is noteworthy in two respects; namely, for the great historical, literary and linguistic value of the text it contains, and for the fact that the editor is the one man pre-eminently fitted for the difficult task of editing the text in question. With the publication of his *Leyenda de los Infantes de Lara* in 1896, the name of Menéndez Pidal became indelibly associated with the old Spanish Chronicles. Since the year 1896 Pidal has published many further studies dealing, directly or indirectly, with the *Crónica General* and the scope of these studies may be illustrated by mentioning his *Crónicas Generales de España* and *El Poema del Cid y las Crónicas Generales de España*, both of which appeared in the year 1898; and the *Aluacaxi y la elegía árabe de Valencia* which was published in 1904.

As an historical document the *Primera Crónica General* is the first real history of Spain in the vernacular, being the legitimate successor of the earlier *Anales* and the Latin histories of Rodrigo de Toledo and Lucas de Luy. As a literary monument it is one of the earliest specimens of Spanish prose, and the varied subject matter, the dignity of style, the richness of vocabulary and idiom, make it of inestimable value for the study of the beginnings of Spanish literature. The literary value of the *Crónica General* is especially in evidence when we consider that the remaining prose works written or inspired by Alfonso the Wise, are primarily technical in character; for example, his works on astronomy, his treatise on chess, dice and checkers, his legal codes and single laws, to say nothing of the fragmentary *Septenario*. Furthermore, the specific relation between the *Crónica General* and Spanish epic poetry is most important. Copying as it did the earlier epic poems and forming a primary source for later epic ballads, the relation of Alfonso's *Chronicle* to the various phases of epic poetry can now be studied with the care and detail that were impossible heretofore.

The earliest printed text of the *Crónica General* was published by Florian de Ocampo, Zamora, 1541, and reprinted in Valladolid, 1604; since then the *Crónica* has not been reprinted or edited. Not long after the appearance of the 1541 edition, Jerónimo Zurita discovered that Ocampo's version seemed to be replete with most

serious errors and omissions ; in short, the need of a new and reliable edition was made known over three centuries ago. Pidal, in the preface to the present volume, discusses the various futile plans for publishing a reliable edition of the *Crónica General* : the first by Tomás Tamayo y Vargas, Royal Chronicler of Philip IV, between the years 1625 and 1637 ; the second by Juan Lucas Cortés, at the command of Charles II ; the third by the Spanish Academy, which appears to have abandoned the project shortly after 1863 ; finally, the edition contemplated by the original *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*, which ceased its editorial work in 1878. It would seem, however, that the third and fourth failures are in part atoned for, in that a member of the Spanish Academy has at last published an edition in the new *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles*.

Pidal's edition contains the critical text and variants, and forms a volume of seven hundred and seventy-four double column pages. The forthcoming second volume will contain an explanation of the method adopted in the text construction, enumeration and study of the manuscripts ; also a study of the date and sources, vocabulary, index of proper names, and, as appendix, the *Crónica Abreviada de don Juan Manuel*. It is not improbable that a year or more will pass before the appearance of the second volume. Hence, it is to be regretted that the editor did not include in Volume I some account of the manuscripts with their dates and interrelations ; even a note supplementing the material furnished in the *Inf. de Lara* and *Crónicas Generales de España* would have been a most welcome guide for the numerous variants that accompany the text. In any case, however, an account and estimate of the editor's critical work would have to be postponed to a second article, when Volume II shall have appeared. In the meantime, we have access to a reliable version of Alfonso's *Chronicle*. The reading and consulting of this massive work is simplified not only by a table of contents (which is lacking in the Ocampo edition), but by running titles at the top of each page, numbered lines for each column of text, and consecutive numbering for the eleven hundred and thirty-five chapters.

The text is divided into two parts. The first part contains the *Prólogo* and chapters 1-565, beginning with *De cuemo Moysen escriuio el libro que ha nombre Genesis, e del diluvio*, and continuing to the election of King Pelayo. This first part corresponds, approximately, to Ocampo's first two books. The second part contains chapters 566-1134, and ends with the title of a missing chapter which treated of the *Miraglos que Dios hizo por el sancto rey don Fernando, que yaze en Seuilla, despues que fue finado*. The basic manu-

script for the first part is Escorial Y-i-2, that for the second part is Escorial X-i-4, and the volume contains a full page facsimile of each.¹ The total number of mss. cited in the variants is more than two dozen, but this gives no adequate idea of the number actually collated by the editor. Riaño knew thirty-one mss. of the *Crónica General* as early as 1869, and Pidal used thirty-three for his previous edition of the chapters on the *Infantes de Lara* alone. The variants to the present edition at times include a ms.-reading of later chronicles not directly related to the *Primera Crónica General* ; for example, *Cron. de 1404*, and *Cron. de Castilla* (p. 564, col. 2). Finally, several early printed works are used to throw light on the critical text : Ocampo's edition is utilized throughout the text ; the 1512, 1593 and 1594 (Huber) editions of the *Crónica del Cid* are used in connection with the chapters dealing with Rodrigo Diaz (cf. p. 532, col. 2) ; the *Crónica de San Fernando*, Sevilla, 1526, is cited frequently in connection with the reign of Ferdinand III. In short, Pidal has accomplished a most valuable as well as most laborious work, and has utilized all extant sources of information for the elucidation of his text.

It is well known at the present time that the edition of Ocampo is a very creditable piece of editorial work, though the particular ms. he used has disappeared. Nevertheless, the ms. used by Ocampo was not the *Crónica General* itself, but a reworking of a version now lost, which lost version contained many variations from Alfonso's original. Hence Pidal has designated Ocampo's edition as one of the versions of the *Tercera Crónica General*, since it is later than a second reworking known as the *Crónica de 1344*. As we might naturally suppose, the Ocampo-text is, at times, far different from the *Primera Crónica General*, and shows not only omissions but additions and transpositions. A general idea of these divergencies has already been given by Pidal in a previous publication.² A portion of the title of the book under review states that "se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289." This statement is based on a passage in the reign of Ramiro I, where the author or compiler, after generalizing concerning the reconquest of Spain from the infidels, remarks :

"et la an ganada dessos enemigos de la Cruz, et del mar de Sant Ander fastal mar de Caliz, sinon poco que les finca ende ya ; et es esto ya en el regnado del muy noble et muy alto rey don Sancho el quarto, en la era de mill et CCC et XXVII annos." (Cf. p. 363, col. 1.)

¹ These are the same mss. for which Riaño showed a preference in 1869. Cf. *Discursos leidos ante la Academia de la Historia*, Madrid, 1869, p. 44.

² *Crónicas Generales de España*, pp. 83-85.

This reference to the date is not found in the Ocampo text; it is lacking also in two mss. of the *Primera Crónica* and one ms. of the *Crónica de 1344*.

As a linguistic document the *Crónica General* holds a place commensurate with its literary and historical importance. This new edition affords the means of solving many problems of language and style, and contains a fund of illustrative material bearing on questions of historical grammar. For example, proclisis of atonic pronouns is not confined to contraction of identical vowels and to cases where the atonic pronoun comes between the verb and the auxiliary (*tornar sa*, *tornado sa*). The first part of the *Crónica General* shows at times a construction that the reviewer has not noted in the manuscript of the second part; namely, *et sapoderauan dellas* (18, 2. 22), *e sapoderassen de la cibdat* (32, 1. 13), *tanto tam* (40, 1. 52), *quanto mal ma uenido* (42, 1. 19), *que yo en tal punto mayuntasse contigo* (39, 2. 49), *e desta guisa sapoderaron d'Espanna* (15, 1. 22). It is evident that the question of apocope of atonic pronouns in prose must be restudied in the light of the new text, and we await with interest the promised contribution on this matter by Pidal himself.³

One further point may be cited in illustration of the linguistic element. The *Poema del Cid* contains two striking examples of anacoluthon where 'well' or 'well and good' must be understood as the apodosis of a conditional sentence, in order to make intelligible a following *si non*. The first example occurs in the Cid's reply to the Jews when they ask a *piel vermeja* as a bonus:

"Plazme," dixo el Cid "da qui sea mandada.
Siuos la aduxier dalla ; si non contalda sobre las areas."
(l. 181.)

In the second example, the Cid, taking leave of Minaya whom he is sending on a mission to Castille, says :

"A la tornada, si nos fallaredes aqui ;
Si non, do sopieredes que somos, yndos conseguir."
(l. 832.)

The *Primera Crónica General* shows three similar constructions in passages that are not found in the Ocampo text. The following example is a close parallel to those cited from the *Poema del Cid*, in that the future subjunctive occurs in the first clause and the second clause is introduced by *si non* :

"Si lo quisiere el fazer ; si non, quel dixiessen que el farie y lo suyo." (497, 2. 5.)

³Cf. *Cultura Espanola*, 1906, p. 1106.

A second example shows the future subjunctive in the first clause but *pero* instead of *si non* in the second clause :

Si este conseio fuere tenido por bueno et tomado en buena parte, pero trae perigo conssigo. (698, 2. 3.)

The scope of the anacoluthon is still further extended in the following sentence where the two supplementary relative clauses take the place of the affirmative and negative conditional clauses :

"Los cristianos fueron todos confesados, los que podieron auer clérigos, et los que non, unos con otros."
(726, 2. 28.)

Which may be translated, 'Those who were fortunate enough to find priests, so much the better for them ; those who could not find priests, confessed to each other.' If this interpretation is correct, it seems advisable to substitute a semicolon for the comma after *clérigos*, likewise after *parte* in the preceding example, thus making the punctuation uniform with that of the remaining three examples cited above. It is not the intention of the present review to study or mention the various linguistic problems suggested by the text, but it is hoped that the foregoing citations may suffice to emphasize the interest of the text for the student of language.

The editorial work has been done with the greatest care and too much credit can not be given for the skill shown in the punctuation of the many lengthy and involved passages which would otherwise remain obscure. There is, however, a lack of uniformity in the syllabification of the consonant groups *ss*, *nn* and even *rr*. The first two are so distinctly digraphs in Old Spanish as are *rr*, *ll*, or *ch*. To be sure, the division of syllables is very inconsistent in the early mss., but in a critical edition the editor is not going beyond his prerogative in avoiding such forms as *pens-sar* (419, 2. 7.), *ssen-nalada* (740, 1. 39.), *cor-rió* (372, 2. 12.), side by side with the more correct forms *ua-ssallo* (719, 2. 33.), *se-nnor* (693, 1. 41.), *ye-rras* (377, 2. 1.).

The following misprints have been noted : *manerad e* for *manera de*, 30, 1. 14 ; *qartie* for *partie*, 130, 1. 32 ; *pue* for *que*, 130, 1. 35 ; *lo* for *la*, 161, 1. 19 ; *qne* for *que*, 166, 2. 45, -243, 2. 2, -260, 2. 22, -284, 1. 15, -726, 2. 7 ; *Bab-nnia* for *Babilonia*, 221, 2. 43 ; *period* 243, 2. 55 ; *ei* for *el*, 293, 2. 14 ; *period*, 368, 2. 25 ; *mueste* for *muerte*, 384, 1. 4 ; *aqui* for *aquí*, *los* for *las*, 399, 1. 21 ; *sennor* for *señor*, 592, 1. 5 ; *mando et* for *et mando*, 601, 1. 50 ; *torna*, *bodas* for *tornabodas*, 603, 2. 22 ; *tue* for *fue*, 767, 1. 14. There are, furthermore, a few cases where misprints seem a plausible explanation for certain unusual (though not impossible) forms or constructions, which show no variant readings in the

other MSS.; for example, *tod estas tierras*, 7, 1. 8; *en mediel puerto*, 32, 2. 51; *mostraron io*, 33, 2. 4; *descubiertamientra*, 67, 1. 19; *con tod*, 251, 1. 12; *beldos*, 274, 1. 30; *muchodumbre* 305, 1. 37; *demotrar*, 315, 2. 49; *mietre*, 377, 1. 46; *buenna*, 414, 1. 38; *non sabien niguno*, 570, 1. 24; *con llos*, 726, 1. 20.

The *Crónica General* is one of the great books of Spain; and bearing in mind the great length of the text and the large number of extant MSS., the present edition is probably the most laborious single piece of critical editing within the field of Spanish literature. Let us hope that the appearance of the second volume will not be long delayed.

C. CARROLL MARDEN.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

MILTON'S FAME.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—Have students of English literature noted the following *locus* in the history of Milton's fame? On December 15, 1690, the Swiss scholar, Vincent Minutoli, wrote to Bayle, the author of the *Dictionary*: “Tous les Anglois lettrés que j'ai connus, m'ont extrêmement prôné ce Poème écrit en leur langue par Milton et intitulé Adam [i. e. *Paradise Lost*]; ils m'en ont parlé comme du non plus ultra de l'esprit humain,” etc. (*Choix de la Correspondance Inédite de Pierre Bayle*, ed. by E. Gigas, Copenhagen, 1890, p. 579). There are numerous earlier *loci* than this, and that of William Hog is exactly contemporary, but none seems to me quite so significant as this disinterested testimony of an intelligent foreign witness.

J. E. SPINGARN.

Columbia University.

THE EYES AS GENERATORS OF LOVE.

To the Editors of Mod. Lang. Notes.

SIRS:—In reply to the note of Mr. Harris in your issue of June last, I would say that the idea of the eyes as generators of love may well have reached Shakespeare thru some medium other than Jacopo da Lentino, who himself obtained it probably from the troubadours, refugees at the court of Frederic II. The doctrine, ‘traces of which,’ says L. F. Mott,¹ ‘were found in earlier

writers, was developed by Chrétien de Troyes with such subtlety, that it became an essential element of the theory of love. All the later poets employ it, and Huon de Méry² alludes to it as the property of Chrétien.’

Mr. Mott refers to a number of passages in *Cligés*; one may here suffice:

“Ce qu' Amors m'aprant et ansaingne,
Doi je garder et maintenir,
Car tost m'an puet granz biens venir.
Mes trop me bat, ice n'esmaie.
Ja n'i pert il ne cos ne pliae,
Et si te plains? Don n'as tu tort?
Nenil : qu'il m'a navre si fort
Que jusqu'au cuer m'a son dart tret,
N'ancor ne l'a a lui retret.
Comant le t'a done tret el cors,
Quant la plaie ne pert de hors?
Ce me diras, savoir le vuel!
Par ou le t'a il tret? Par l'uel.
Par l'uel? Si ne le t'a creve?
An l'uel ne m'a il rien greve,
Mes el cuer me grieve formant, etc.

(*Cligés*, l. 686 sq.)

Foerster places the composition of *Cligés* between 1152 and 1164, *i. e.*, a century or more before the Sicilian poet.

Flamenca, a poem much nearer to Jacopo in point of time, furnishes further testimony as to the wide dissemination of the theory in question:

Conssi Amors la poinera
Ab lo dart ques ieu al cor
S'ella nom ve dins o defor?
Car s'il m'auzis o sim parles,
O si m'auzis (corr. vezes) o sim toques
Adono la pogra ben combatre
Fin'amors per un d'aquetz quatre, etc.

(*Flamenca*, 1st ed., Meyer, l. 2746 sq.)

It is a typical case of the itinerary of ideas—from France or Provence to Italy, thence perhaps to England—there are some gaps in the course.

Dante may have learned the doctrine from his literary ancestor, Jacopo. That the great poet gave due honor to the comparatively unknown one is proven by *Purg. xxiv*, 52 sq.,—a passage remarkable for its pithy criticism.

In the well-known sonnet,³ “Amore e cor gentil sono una cosa,” Dante says:

“Beltate appare in saggia donna pui,
Che piace agli occhi sì, che dentro al core
Nasce un desio della cosa piacente:
E tanto dura talora in costui,
Che fa sveglier lo spirito d'amore:
E simil face in donna uomo valente.”

MARY VANCE YOUNG.

Mount Holyoke College.

¹ *System of Courtly Love*, p. 31.

² *Tournoiment de l'Antecrit*, p. 77.

³ *Vita Nuova*, xx.